

17/1

Vol. 17 : No. 1. JAN. 1973

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

GANDHI
MARG

ABDULLAH / MULK RAJ ANAND / A. APPADORAI / V. BALASUBRA-
 MANIAN / CHINAI / DURGA DAS / DIWAKAR / FERNANDES / D. K.
 GUPTA / MAHTAB / MALKANI / MANKEKAR / SHRIHARI NARAYAN
 RADHAKRISHNA / RUTHNASWAMY / MANUBHAI SHAH / S. SHUKLA
 K. SUBRAHMANYAM / C. SUBRAMANIAM / KRITZER / RAM RATTAN

IN BACK NUMBERS

1987

January

V. S. Narayana : Some Reflections on Optimism
William Robert Miller : Violence and the Christian Ethic
Josephine Holcomb : Gandhi at the Round Table Conference
P. Nagendra Rao : Gandhi and the Hindu Concept of Ahimsa

April

Thomas Merton : Terror and the Absurd
Theodor Ebert : The Meaning of Nonviolent Resistance
Jerzy Sawicki : The Perspectives of Peace Research
Horace Alexander : Ends and Means in the Pursuit of Peace

July

Martin Luther King : The Casualties of the War in Vietnam
John R. Batey : The Concept of Deterrence
R. R. Dheskar : Gandhi and Man in Evolution
Theodor Ebert : Nonviolence : Doctrine or Technique?

October

J. B. Kripalani : The Meaning of Swadeshi
Donald H. Bishop : Gandhi and the Concept of Love
Kareem Monsour and Martin Grotjahn : Racial Prejudice and the Intest Taboo
T. V. Parvate : Tilak and Gandhi

1988

January

Martin Luther King : The Crisis in America's Cities
Mama B. Byline : Truth is God
Jagadeeksh Nereyan : The Outlook for Peace in India
Rolph David Abernathy : Religion and World Peace

April

Robert Steele : The American Dream Becomes a Nightmare
Bo Winmark : The Changing Ideology of Nonviolence
T. K. Mahadevan : Democracy and the New Generation
Noam Chomsky : The Revolutionary Pacifism of A. J. Muste

July

Maurice Friedman : Martin Luther King An American Gandhi and a Modern Job
Melford Q. Sibley : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Revolution
Stuart Nelson : Black Power and the Poor People's Campaign
Adam Roberts : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Resistance

October

James W. Douglass : Is there a Politics without Violence?
Geoffrey Ashe : Can Nonviolence Change Society?
H. J. M. Horsburgh : Nonviolence and Impotence
R. R. Dheskar : Truth and Nonviolence : New Dimensions

SANDHI MARG
SANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

GANDHI MARG 64

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME SEVENTEEN NUMBER ONE JANUARY 1973

Editors

G. Ramachandran

T. K. Mahadevan

18 APR 1973

Editorial Board

R. R. Diwakar

J. B. Kripalani

Jayaprakash Narayan

Abid Hussain

Vijayl Hari

G. Ramachandran

Shrinis Narayan

Bhavani Prasad Mishra

Radhakrishna

Devendra Kumar Gupta

T. K. Mahadevan (Convener)



Contents

Editorials	1	Long live Rajaj
	3	The growing dilemma
Symposium	6	India 1973: Some crucial questions
Herbert M. Kritzer	53	The military as a target of protest
Ram Rattan	84	The anatomy of Gandhi's aniyogtha

Rs. 3.00 a year in South Asia ; \$ 2.50 elsewhere : postfree. Rs. 3.00 (\$ 1.00) the copy. Payment in advance. Publication dates : 15 Jan., 15 Apr., 15 Jul., 15 Oct. Complaints about non-receipt : (inland) within 15 days, (foreign) within 30 days. Remittances by bank drafts or postal or money orders only. Published by T. K. Mahadewan for the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 231-734, Datta Deyal Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi and printed by him at the Kaveri Printing Press, New Delhi. (Library of Congress Card No. 59-47394)

Editorials

LONG LIVE RAJAH

With the passing away of Chakravarthi Rajagopalachariar, the last giant of the gandhians era has left us. But even among these giants Rajaji held a unique position. It was a most astonishing phenomenon that he remained closest to Mahatma Gandhi for an unbroken period of fifty years and yet, more often than any other leader of India, distanced from him and even sharply differed on occasions from the great Master. Curiously, Gandhi loved and trusted him, the more Rajaji distanced and went on his own way. This was possible only because Gandhi never even for a moment doubted his sincerity, courage and truthfulness. Gandhi also, while giving the utmost consideration to Rajaji's views, would go his own way leaving Rajaji to work out his own destiny. But distrust and separation occurred only rarely, even if, on very vital issues. But most of the time Rajaji never questioned the leadership of Gandhi. He did so because he too believed that Gandhi was the bravest, the most truthful and the most selfless of leaders. Thus the bond between Gandhi and Rajaji stood every strain and challenge of India's political revolution which brought India from bondage to freedom.

Let no one weep or sob that beloved and revered Rajaji has passed away. Conventional words, spoken or written, would be totally inappropriate on this occasion. Rajaji lived longer than any of our leaders. He died at his ninety-fifth year. There never was a fatter, richer, nobler and dedicated life than Rajaji's. People looked at the simplicity of his life, and thought he was an ascetic. The truth was his life was radiantly variegated and he was at heart a supreme artist of life. He loved music and literature, painting and architecture. He was deeply immersed in the beauties of Sanskrit, Tamil and English literatures. Strangely, this man of religion and philosophy was a great admirer of Bernard Shaw. Even in the stress and strain of politics, he was a care artist picking his way with profound care through the labyrinth of events and personalities. Rajaji the writer will be more immortal than Rajaji the politician.

One look at the glorious record of his life will in itself be an education. A brilliant speaker, writer, valiant social reformer and fighter for freedom, a magnificent conversationalist, a deep devotee of God in the best sense of the word, he took the whole of life as a spiritual challenge and always met the challenge, fearless and truthful.

There were many glaring contradictions in his life. They only proved that he was not a slave to consistency. He reacted to changing conditions in utterly unexpected and different ways. This is not the time to go into that story. But underneath his contradictions was a passionate and throbbing love of India and the Indian people and an unquenchable thirst to serve them to the best of his ability. Even his dearest and closest friends sometimes stood aghast at the contradictions in his life and work. But not one of them doubted his sincerity or rectitude. That was why his enemies were sometimes his best friends and his best friends continued to trust him in spite of everything which appeared baffling.

There has rarely been in our history a leader more respected by opponents than Rajaji. There was the arch-heretic S. Ramaswami who differed from Rajaji on many matters but who testified that he had no other guru except Rajaji. The Marxist Communist leader Sankaran Namboodripad wrote recently that he differed from nobody more than he differed from Rajaji and yet there was no leader in the Congress he respected more than Rajaji. This is something unique in the history of India that even the acutest political differences did not matter and that in spite of them Rajaji was universally admired and trusted. I think it was the late President John Kennedy of the U.S.A. who said of him that he had seldom met a person who had a more civilizing influence on him than Rajaji. Pandit Nehru grew to like and admire Rajaji greatly. In fact, Pandit Nehru is bidding goodbye to Rajaji as the Governor General of India, admitted openly how much he was drawn to him.

Rajaji occupied some of the biggest places in the public life of India and yet he ever remained simple and unostentatious till the very end. He never lost the common touch. He had an unusual understanding of men and women. It was the late Jammalal Bajaj who said of Rajaji that the man was yet to be born who could deceive him. His large dark eyes would probe into the souls of men and women. He was long called the Gandhi of South India. It was he who brought khadi into the lives of millions. It was he who took the poison of caste and untouchability out of the hearts of millions. It was he who took away the thirst for liquor from the mouths of millions of people. It was he who put the love and fear of God into the minds of millions. It was he who demonstrated that the lowest among men had the right to dissent from the greatest among men. He was thus a fearless pro-

phet of dissent, but he showed also to millions that dissent and reverence can go hand in hand. His Tamil writings will live as long as Tamil lives. As a thinker he penetrated into the heart of every problem. He lived such a life for ninety-five years. That is why no one should weep he has passed away. Let us rather weep for ourselves that we are unworthy of him. Let us rejoice that such a man lived in India, that we could see him, hear him and know him.

The tributes that have come pouring from the ends of the earth show how his greatness had come to be recognized far beyond the frontiers of India.

Such a man cannot die. Death loses its meaning when applied to the passing away of such a man.

Long Live Rajaji!

G. RAMACHANDRAN

THE CROWNING DILEMMA

Although the Symposium that follows this article, and which is the main highlight of this number, deals with problems, it is perhaps more precise to say that what we are confronted with in this country—and indeed elsewhere in the world—is a succession of dilemmas. The difference between a problem and a dilemma is not certainly the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, it is a qualitative difference. A problem oriented approach is not only needlessly plain, it tends to be weighted towards fact-finding. This scapegoat-hunt (as one might call it) leads not to the solution of problems but to the setting up of a Rogues' Gallery. It does often succeed in demonstrating, with much finesse, a direct causal relationship between problems and the men (or women!) responsible for them. Having done so, however, the scapegoat hunters rest on their oars, leaving the problems to fester in neglect and the rogues to stew in their own juice. Ironically enough, this is the stuff of which politics in our country is largely made.

The dilemmatic approach, on the other hand, does not look for scapegoats. It does not assume that things have got to be either black as coal or white as snow. Rather it recognizes that the situation in which men and societies find themselves is more in the nature of a quandary, admitting of several solutions or no solution at all. A man who perceives a dilemma for what it is, is a humble man. He is not a man in a hurry.

He points no accusing finger at another. He is never the one to cast the first stone.

New Gandhi was such a man. A politician to his fingertips, he nevertheless worked with dilemmas rather than with the customary polarization of problems and solutions. His perception of human dilemmas was acute to the point of agony. Not for him the easy way of tracing each difficult situation to some individual locus of power. He did not end his days—days of bitter anguish for him—pointing an accusing finger at Nehru and Patel. He did not throw a spittoon in the works—as he well might have done—when the infant Indian Government woke up to discover that the first item on its agenda was a war on the western front. It is Gandhi's followers who talk of violence and nonviolence as though these are mutually repellent qualities. Gandhi saw deeper.

What then is the precise nature of India's ailment? What is its aetiology? Is it a compound of several causes or can we, by a process of simplification, reduce it to a single, pervasive cause? Or will such means end up in narrow?

Let us take a leaf from Gandhi's own book. He saw long ago—long before he turned on the Indian political scene—that the essential human dilemma was simply the *dilemma of excess*. There are not words that he used himself, but the implications of his message are plain as a plinth. Excess is the hallmark of modern civilization, even as austerity is the hallmark of its ancient (especially Indian) precursor. Indeed they are two different kinds of civilization. Gandhi weighed them both, and having done so he had little hesitation in rejecting the excess, the indulgence and the amission.

Monist that he was, Gandhi saw that the antithetical excess with which man is threatened is his excessive technology. Man has ever been a tool-maker and a tool-user. Man's tools be anything. Without them he would have long ago vanished from the face of the earth. (By tools we do not obviously mean the hardware alone but also such brilliant innovations as language.) But when his tools grew in power, it was paradoxically man himself that diminished. In the result, modern hyper-technology is very like Aladdin's lamp: it will give us everything we want except keep us our own masters!

Now one of the (questionable) blessings of technology is that it has enabled man, without let or hindrance, to scatter his seed around—so that the day is not far off when the earth will be peopled not by countless varieties of flora and fauna but almost exclusively by his own spawn. Old-fashioned naturalists, hearing of such a prospect, would turn in their graves. Innumerable species have bowed out when their populations exploded beyond a critical number. Will man too vanish from the scene of his screaming offspring? Not he! He is too adaptable, too flexible, too cunning. And don't forget his tools. All that he need do is develop a

technology of survival and he can go on and on. If the earth is too full he can colonise Jupiter and the furthest galaxy. Besides he has the unique capacity of living on words and other such unsubstantial things!

The crowning dilemma then, let us say for India, is that a country which might have supported, with some semblance of decency, three hundred million people, already finds itself saddled with almost double that number and is well on its way to reaching a billion before the end of the century. What can any government—socialist, capitalist, gandhian or other—do in such a situation? In an aid-weary world, or where for good reasons old sources of aid are fast drying up, whence will India find the wherewithal to feed, clothe, house, educate, employ and entertain—defining these in the barest terms—such a teeming lot of people? In any case, what kind of a socialist utopia (or gandhian ramayana) can conceivably be built upon an anthracite?

Obviously, what we have on our hands is not a problem for which a solution might be found or, alternatively, a scapegoat who could be nailed on the cross, what we are faced with is a dilemma. The acquiring of this perception is the first step.

To resolve a dilemma is not as easy as it is to solve a problem or to pillory the Establishment—any Establishment. It is a process which lies beyond the pale of politics and ideology. Or, using the example of Gandhi, one might say that it is politics of another kind and order—though we trouble to say this, seeing that the gandhian brand of politics has so far had but a poor ratings.

What then do we do? Where do we go from here? Every signpost that we see is turned in the direction of disaster. Since we can neither halt nor turn back, is there any other option but to lean against the nearest signpost and curse the cost of our farther journey?

This cost can be briefly stated: (a) With its substance progressively eroded, the shell of democracy will fall apart, leaving in its train a new and elusive form of technological authoritarianism; (b) the barricades between the elite and the have-nots will grow increasingly invulnerable, with the latter reduced to a state of impotent frustration and living in a fantasy of expectations; (c) with the punitive powers of the state enlarged beyond recall, the last flicker of revolution will be finally extinguished.

What more can one or need one say?

T. E. MANMADEYAN

India 1973: Some Crucial Questions

A SYMPOSIUM

SHAIKH ABDULLAH

MOLE DAS AKAND

A. APPADURAI

V. BALASUBRAMANIAN

RAMSRIJAL M. CHINAI

DURGADA DAS

S. R. DWIVAKAR

ARCHDEACON FERNANDES

DEVENDRA KUMAR GUPTA

HAREKRISHNA HANTAR

E. R. MALEKANI

D. R. MANICKAR

SERMAN NARAYAN

RADHAKRISHNA

M. RUTHERFORD

MANUSHAJ SHAN

S. SHUKLA

K. SUBRAMANYAM

C. SUBRAMANIAM

PROSPECTUS

- ☐ The perception of problems is as important as the formulation of solutions. An unperceived problem has a way of throwing ideas into disarray by surfacing when least expected. A misperceived problem often reduces the effectiveness of planning. A problem perceived in the wrong order leads to much national waste.
- ☐ This symposium is thus Janus-faced. It lists no problems. Rather it asks contributors to look both ways: to identify the problems as well as to provide the answers.
- ☐ In the nature of things, an exercise of this kind has to be selective. Not simply for reasons of printing space. Problem solving is essentially a continuing process. Otherwise politicians and planners would soon be out of business.
- ☐ What is the precise purpose of this symposium? Not certainly to build up a roster of the multitudinous problems bedeviling our

national life. Not indeed to provide everyone a chance to exhibit the particular bee in his bonnet.

- ☐ Rather, the symposium is actuated by the belief that, given the framework, the perceptual spectrum is bound to be narrow, with most contributors asking and answering the same kind of questions.
- ☐ The phrase 'India 1973' is not intended to be restrictive. But in an age of galloping change, India can no longer afford to think and plan timelessly. Even long-term planning is already prehistory.
- ☐ Contributors are asked (a) to identify three major issues facing the country; (b) to argue why, in their view, these are crucial; and (c) to set forth ways of resolving them.
- ☐ These 35 years without Gandhi have seen many fateful changes in our country. But the shape of things to come in the next 25 years boggles one's imagination. Contributors may therefore also, if so disposed, examine relevant gandhian insights which are serviceable in the resolution of contemporary problems.

PROGNOSSES

Sheikh Abdullah

The three major issues facing the country, in my opinion, are: (1) building up of the national character; (2) internal peace and stability, and (3) foreign relations. Let me take these issues seriatim.

Character has always played a significant part in the rise and fall of nations. No country has been able to preserve its independence without building up its national character. India has suffered long periods of slavery during which her national character has received a great setback. The country has achieved its independence after a long and hard struggle. Therefore, building up the national character ought to have received the first priority. This should have been done by completely overhauling the educational system, and thereby building up a new nation. But despite many efforts it has remained a dream. The idealism with which the country fought the battle for freedom and independence has completely disappeared. Power and money have become the main objectives of life, no matter how they are achieved. This has badly eroded the character of the nation.

One is reminded here of the great Latin maxim, 'mens sana in corpore sano', which means 'a sound mind in a sound body'. In order to build up a sound nation, it is necessary to take care of the development of the mind and body of the coming generation, and make available to it adequate medical attention by providing a curriculum incorporating

themselves both the physical and mental needs of the youth. The education and health of the nation must, therefore, receive top priority. Unfortunately, this is not being done. These two portfolios are not considered to be as important as others in the scheme of the Government, the result being that several plans which were drawn up and got ready to usher in a sound educational system according to the requirements of the country were not implemented either for lack of adequate funds or interest. Similarly, enough effort has to be made to improve the health of our growing generation. A healthy body is a happy companion to a healthy mind. Most advanced countries devote very great attention to the development of the youth, both physically and mentally. But unfortunately, here in India this has not been done. A well-planned educational system catering both to the mental and physical development of the youth would go a long way in building up a sound nation.

Secondly, no country can make much progress in its developmental efforts without internal peace and stability. Unfortunately, India has not been able to create such an atmosphere in the country during the last 23 years of its independence. On the contrary, we have been witnessing distressing scenes of disagreement between the rulers and the ruled and severe conflicts between different sections of its population. The only way to improve this situation is by providing effective protection to the life, property and freedom of every citizen of India, without discrimination of caste, creed or religion, in order that he may pursue his normal avocation and feel that he too shares equally with others the responsibility and power that come from building up the country and taking it forward. It is then alone that he will willingly identify himself with the interests of the country and share her joys and sorrows.

Thirdly, the question of India's foreign relations, more particularly with her immediate neighbours. From the points of view of both area and population, India is the second biggest country in Asia. Therefore, psychologically, her small neighbours would look at her with suspicion in regard to her intentions towards them. This is the price that every big country in the world has to pay. But it should not provoke in her an attitude of retaliation. On the contrary, it should always be her endeavour to convince them of her good and friendly relations, adopt a most liberal attitude in resolving the mutual differences and points of friction, if any, and try to establish close economic co-operation. Such a policy alone will serve the long-term interests of India. Our foreign relations should never be influenced by emotions and personal likes or dislikes, nor should India adopt a big brotherly attitude towards her neighbours. This will create more fear and more suspicion towards her and will drive the small neighbours to seek protection somewhere else which may, in the long run, prove detrimental to her national interests and, to a great extent, hinder her developmental efforts.

Mulk Raj Anand

In a time of the decay of faith, such as the present, it is not possible to revive the old philosophies of our country, which were essentially built on devotion.

Under the changed circumstances, when the need for the integration of a dominantly rural society into our agro-industrial order is urgent, it becomes necessary to evolve some new hypotheses, such as may become the basis for a new ethos. Perhaps the inner core of Gandhi's teaching, which was derived from the inner urges of the Indian people, may percolate into a new pattern in this way, in so far as his propheticisms have relevance for the new period.

Thus it becomes necessary, in the next few years, to work out some concepts towards a new philosophy of life for our people, before we can address ourselves to the priorities of a pragmatic program for regeneration.

The premises of this new thought were already put forward before our country by Gandhi, Tagore and Nehru, in the miscellaneous ideas towards the worship of Man, through securing for him basic plenty, as well as the opportunity for growth and integration. This philosophy of Humanism was not defined exactly by any of the three lay thinkers, but it is nevertheless implicit in all our approaches to life.

In our own contemporary period, the resurrection of this concept has taken the form of important initiatives by Mrs Indira Gandhi, in many ways heir to the vitalist teaching of all the three spokesmen for Indian humanism.

Among the various initiatives Mrs Gandhi has taken, the reception of ten million refugees from Bangla Desh, in spite of the poverty of our own people, and the liberation of Bangla Desh through police action, demonstrates her will to transform the situation of political weakness into one of moral courage. And in this, as in her slogan of 'Garibi Hatao', she has demonstrated her faith in the capacity of men to make themselves.

If this ethos could be reinforced by new initiatives, it is quite likely that the intense urges of the bulk of the people towards solidarity would be objectified.

I think that there are three values which could be emphasized during the next few years to make the transition from the vague atmosphere of doom-day, which has been created through natural and other calamities in India, to leading its people towards a more radiant future.

(1) The 'Garibi Hatao' program must begin to involve the people from the village upwards. The centre of administration must be enlivened by a personal appeal from Mrs Indira Gandhi to begin work-

ing far, and with the people, rather than rule them through a Bureaucracy. The voluntary welfare associations, specially from big towns and small towns, should do mass contact at the grassroots level. In this way could the Nehruvian program of a well, a school, a road and electric light in every village be actually realized by individuals and organisations of the better-off sections adopting a village for regeneration. The energies of the rural masses, in the transition period, must flow into those agro-industries which are nearer the rural communities and not into fields of technology beyond their education. And the production of food, cloth, handicrafts and small-scale industries must be made the basis of growth, which may then be diversified into the major industries in the metropolises.

(2) The education system must be revised, reorganised and reorientated towards a vocational bias at all levels. For instance, apart from the B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in Agriculture from the great universities, we really need the kind of school where neo-literate may be able to learn three or four agro-industries, beyond farming. These neo-literates may take to comprehensive farming rather than drift into the town slums. And, unlike the graduates, they may stay on the land rather than go into offices. Again there is scarcely any provision in our redundant education system for imparting literacy, technical education and General Knowledge to workers and peasants and the lower middle classes. There are many colleges for producing millions of unemployed graduates. The B.A. or M.A. degree is considered a status symbol, and not as part of the making of an individual into a dynamic human being, integrated into a new kind of social order different from the societies of the West. The emphasis of education must, then, be tilted towards the great mass and not be concentrated only on the middle sections.

(3) Our goal should be development towards the year 2000. Free India must advance towards helping the survival of man all over the world, rather than merely plan in terms of our own nationhood. The basic propositions of our foreign policy during the liberation struggle and after have been towards internationalism. Jawaharlal Nehru's Panch-Sheel defines the philosophy of brotherhood and not mere regionalism. The implications of this doctrine, in spite of its failure after Bandung, are still relevant in the relationships we must cultivate to help make the Indian Ocean an area of peace. Also, in spite of the European Common Market and the UNCTAD recalcitrance, we must initiate political, trade and cultural relations with all countries of the world, beginning, of course, with our neighbours in the Far East, South-east Asia and Africa. This implies that our friendship with Russia must become the model for our contacts with other countries, with whom we unanimously share one important preoccupation—that

of a hundred years' peace and no Third World War. Such alliances would naturally force one per cent disarmament during the next five years on the super powers, redefine the concept of 'standard of living' of the West, and usher in the era of basic plenty for which mankind is longing as against the consumer's goods luxury productions based on over-technology.

In this context, we should bring our natural sense of hospitality to bear on our attitude to all those people who are opting out of the overfed, expensive, money-mad civilization of Europe and America and wish to come to share poverty and active labour with us. This would mean showing an example of lack of racial discrimination and other prejudices, which still dominate the so-called advanced economies. Before this is possible, we must of course root out our caste discriminations.

We must encourage all those men and women of good will, in our ashrams, schools, universities, and the lay society, which can make India a polyglot, casual united nations area, which may be comparatively less violent than the old and new nation states, proud of their frontiers with the rigid passport and visa systems.

I have not read anything yet about the funds necessary for our development. But we can, by ruthlessly destroying the parallel black-market economy, secure them by demeritization. We must make production by every individual, and the fruits thereof, the basic bedrock of our departure into a new era, as China has done. There can be no recovery unless the blackmarket economy is finished for ever.

Also, there can be no future for India unless the parent of every fourth child is taxed, abortion made legal, and population control made a great deal more effective. Neither God nor Mrs Indira Gandhi can help India if our present population growth is not checked.

A. Appadorai

The Editors have set a challenging task before their contributors to identify three major issues facing the country, to argue why, in their view, these are crucial; and to set forth ways of resolving them.

I shall be content with identifying one major issue.

In my view, the single crucial question which we must begin to tackle at once—though it may take generations to be solved adequately—is the moral crisis in our national life. There is clearly a lack of social conscience in the individual, a lack of consideration, in his actions, for the interests of others, and this adversely affects the fulfilment of our objectives in our economic, political and educational planning.

To illustrate: according to authoritative reports, a substantial portion of our economy is regulated by black money; the growing rate is

prices of commodities is not justified by the admittedly scarce supply of commodities, and is attributable to profiteering by traders and hoarders; public sector enterprises, by and large, are not working as satisfactorily as they should and the innumerable strikes and lockouts result in a large waste of manpower.

In the political sphere, defections by members of legislatures from one party to another for personal advantage, widespread use of political power for personal gain (the reports of inquiry commissions in Bihar and the Punjab are clear evidence); delay and corruption in the conduct of public business; unseemly conduct of legislators in several legislatures, the part that caste plays in elections; steady deterioration of law and order and destruction of public property by those who defy authority (as was evidenced recently in the Telengana-Andhra conflict over the *amla* rules) are ample proof of the lack of social conscience and the moral crisis in the nation.

In the social sphere, communalism, casteism and lack of social mobility illustrate the moral crisis. The frequent occurrence of communal non— which, from all accounts, have increased in number since independence—and the continuing prevalence of untouchability, notwithstanding the directives of the Constitution and the law of the land to the contrary, are facts known to us all. The limited social mobility, arising partly from casteism and communalism, leads to wastage of a vast human potential, there again impeding the creation of conditions favourable for the most able and dynamic people at all social levels to come forward and get ahead.

In education, the moral crisis is there for all to see. Student apathy, often, if not always, for trivial things; garbage, the ‘unpardon’ of the Vice-Chancellor of a University and the assassination of the Vice-Chancellor of another University by students, the burning of buses by them; mass copying at examinations, the steady deterioration in the work done by teachers at all levels and the fall in the standards of education have only to be mentioned and need no elaboration.

Above all, liberty has turned into licence. In a famous passage in the *Republic*, Plato wrote that in a democracy all things are just ready to burst with liberty: ‘The son is on a level with his father, he having no respect or reverence for either of his parents . . . the master fears and flatters his scholars and the scholars despise their masters and tutors; and the young man is on a level with the old . . . and the honest and the just have a way of marching along with all the rights and dignities of freemen and they will run at anybody who comes in their way if he does not leave the road clear for them.’ Have we reached this stage in our democracy?

It is necessary to stress that the moral crisis in our national life, the lack of social conscience, the absence of individual discipline, is a

crucial issue? The fact that it is all-pervasive and affects all aspects of our national life is itself significant. I will, however, myself raise a query and try to answer it. Is not lack of consideration for the interests of others—selfishness, if you please, the grabbing for money and power—only an offshoot of economic insecurity and inequality which, therefore, must be considered the crucial issue? There is some justification for this viewpoint. For can men, living in economic insecurity, ignorance, squalor and disease be expected to display a concern for others' interests when society displays, according to them, such scant regard for their minimum requirements in food, shelter, clothing, health and education? Hence Swami Vivekananda and Gandhi expounded the cause of the *daridranarayan*, the down-trodden. The point is that the moral crisis and the economic malaise are interlinked, and an improvement in one is bound to have a beneficial impact on the other. It is, indeed, pointless to argue which is the greater evil. But one justification for giving pride of place to the moral crisis may be stated. The lack of social conscience is found not only among those who live under conditions of economic insecurity, economic inequality and unemployment, but among the possessing classes, the class who have economic and political power as well.

Now briefly to solutions. I suggest two.

The foregoing analysis will have indicated that economic growth is of course one solution, as other writers in the symposium are certain to deal with this, I desist from taking space here to develop this point. I should like only to say here that self-sufficiency in food for the nation is priority number one. And in attempting this gigantic and essential task, adequate place must be given to small-scale and medium irrigation works—wells, tanks, tube wells; these must not only be constructed but maintained; food supply must not, any longer, be a gamble on the monsoon.

The second solution is the planned development of a cadre of social workers—attached to nationally recognised social service institutions like the *Seva Neta Sangh*, the *Servants of India Society* and the *Ramakrishna Mission*—who will, by their dedicated service, give a tonic to national life. I have in mind, ultimately, a million social workers trained and controlled by the three institutions mentioned above and spread all over the country, in villages as well as in towns; we may start with a target of one hundred thousand. Here Gandhi's insight is BOM useful. In his last political testament, written on 27 January 1948, he wrote: 'The Congress has won political freedom, but it has yet to win economic freedom, social and moral freedom. These freedoms are harder than the political, if only because they are continuous, less exciting and not spectacular. All-embracing constructive work evokes the energy of all the parts of the nation . . . On its own register it

(the Congress) will have a body of servants of the nation, who would be workers doing the work allotted to them, from time to time. . . . These servants will be expected to operate upon and to serve the voters . . . in their own surroundings.' The Congress did not heed the Mahatma's advice; the constructive work of moral regeneration he envisaged remains to be done.

The State or a political party cannot, by its very nature, do the work of moral regeneration. That is why I have suggested that the three national social service organizations must take upon themselves the unfinished task. A blueprint of how organized social work can be done effectively needs to be prepared. Briefly these trusted organizations, working according to moral standards, have to recruit between them, to start with, say, a hundred thousand social workers; the necessary finance must be provided by the State; the work of the Christian missionaries in India and elsewhere shows how devoted social work can be planned, organized and implemented with success. The workers should not be expected to renounce the world or shun the normal amenities of life. By living among the community, in villages and towns, they will set an example of dedicated life, by manning key positions in voluntary organizations, cooperative societies, trade unions, panchayats and the like, they will help to purify public life, help citizens to shun conduct which must be avoided and to observe rules of conduct which will help to achieve public good in the best sense of the term. A million men in our devoted army help to protect the country against foreign aggression; a hundred thousand men in our social army—to start with—should help to save the country from moral degeneration.

V. Balasubramanian

To me the most important public issue for the year 1973 is whether the nation is going to cry halt to the proliferating cancer of corruption which is eating into the vitals of politics, business and the services. It is now an open secret that illegal monies circulate freely among ministers and officials of high or low degree and obtain illegitimate favours for businesses, big or small. Close even are these relatively comfortable days when it was possible for the citizens, in their innocence, to assume that money, black and bad, was revenged or coerced in a big way into party coffers and, incidentally, into the pockets of fund-collecting ministers or their benevolent headmen, only during election time. Graft has become as normal a feature of public affairs in our country as inflation is of its economic affairs.

Given this wide prevalence of corruption in politics, business and government, much of the development or welfare programs financed out of public funds and most of the massive apparatus of controls, allegedly

maintained for regulating the economy in the public interest, have simply become a gigantic hoax or fraud on the people. Perhaps the most intolerable aspect of this impossible situation is that the citizens of this country have become listless or feel helpless about it all.

Not a day passes, it is true, without agitations or demonstrations, which often turn violent, but they are invariably protests against the symptoms of the disease, which is the grievous setting of standards or values in politics, business and administration. Prices indeed are rising; shortages, obviously, are spreading; unemployment, no doubt, is growing; and the poor still hug their poverty, while the rich continue to live in a world of their own. But how many of us realise that all this is happening, not because politicians do not know how to run a government, officials are incompetent in administration or businessmen inefficient in commerce or industry, but simply because private greed has suppressed a sense of accountability to the public at all levels of politics, business and the services? Or, knowing that this is so, how many of us have come forward to do something about it, at least to the extent of talking about it? And when I say this, I do not mean the talk that goes on by way of gossip along the cocktail circuit—of this there is an abundance, of course; I mean talking openly and furiously, with fire in one's belly.

Possibly I am too pessimistic. There is, after all, currently, in Tamil Nadu, a movement come to surface against corruption in government and public life. The people, it seems, do care and their patience, presumably, is not infinite. But then, granted that the heart of the public is still sound, how has the so-called class been using its head? Given the way this movement is being conducted, or its meaning or implications are being stirred over by those who claim to be leading or guiding public opinion, including the gentlemen of the press, it seems to me that there is every danger of a popular protest against a public evil being prevented from blossoming into a cleansing national crusade (which, having started, so to speak, at Kanyakumari will duly extend to Kashmir) and, instead, being allowed to get lost in the petty manoeuvres of power politics. Had Gandhi lived, he would have died to ensure that the people's sense of outrage triumphed.

With 1972 having given expression to a fierce outbreak of regionalism, through a violent agitation over the 'malki rules' in Andhra Pradesh, I am naturally led to wonder whether the fire of parochialism will burn even more destructively in the year ahead. I am not concerned here with the merits of the 'malki rules' controversy; there is always much to be said on either side in such debates. What interests and alarms me here is that we have had yet another demonstration of the creeping paralysis of national disengagement to which our body politic seems to have fallen prey. The Andhra people are not by any means the lost sinners,

nor are they even the worst sinners. In Maharashtra and, latterly, in West Bengal, it has become a policy of the state government concerned to treat people from other parts of the country as second-class citizens for purposes of employment, whether in government offices or in private firms. If other states have not been behaving this way, it is not because the people or the politicians in those states are more enlightened, the difference, simply, is that they do not so far have a problem in this respect. For instance, not many people move from Maharashtra to Madras City in search of jobs nor from West Bengal to Kerala.

Gandhi united India in the freedom struggle. He would not have wished to see an India independent become a house divided against itself. He foresaw, perhaps, that what would immediately happen to a poor people, if frustrated in their aroused expectations of material wellbeing, was a loss of their sense of kinship among themselves and that every Indian, in such circumstances, would see all other Indians as competing with him and with one another in a struggle for survival. Gandhi, no doubt, had a whole personal philosophy of life to be pitted against the gospel of the machine age. I suspect, however, that he also had a shrewd feeling that a program of industrialization that failed to live up to the false promise of painless material progress would be a great divider of the Indian people.

Finally, will 1973 see some abatement of the resentful frustration which seems to be poisoning the psyche of the student world? In Gandhi's scheme of things, the men and women of the younger generation were to be the great liberators. He saw them as a flow of evolutionary harmony linking the past to its future. He knew that the older generation had its uses, but he was wholly conscious that the younger generation had the right to use the older. It was not for nothing that those grand field armies for his non-cooperation campaigns came so spontaneously from the ranks of men and women in the twenties or early thirties of their lives. It was, again, not incidental to Gandhi's sorrow over the schools of violent political action that they distorted youth's perspective of what freedom ought to mean for India or what must follow that freedom for the good of the India of tomorrow.

Today not many in positions of influence or authority in public life seem to care very much what use the young have for a future or what use the future may have for the young. This is both a cause as well as a consequence of the younger generation losing confidence in the older and the latter losing confidence in itself. The Five Year Plans, whether they have done anything else or not, certainly seem to have interminably restricted our vision of historic time. In a literal way this country has come to live from day to day; and Gandhi, now dead for 35 years, is being gathered more and more into a non-past in a country which is finding it increasingly difficult to believe in any future.

Babubhai M. Chinai

It is only a quarter of a century since one of these great figures of history, who lived with us, spoke to us, taught us the way of civilized living, has passed away. A whole generation has grown without knowing his live presence, save the homages paid to the Mahatma now and then by the older people. Even they seem to have forgotten his message. If we go by results, who can deny the moral constricting of politics? How can anyone ignore the violence of language and even physical violence that mark our society? There is considerable talk of new perspectives, new priorities, new attitudes and new assessments. Yet there seems to be no understanding of what we are evolving towards.

Gandhi had said, 'I have nothing new to teach the world. Truth and nonviolence are as old as the hills.' This was characteristic of a noble soul. Indeed his philosophy is comprehensive and covers all aspects of life. In these days when it is fashionable to talk of change, we overlook that Gandhi was a practitioner of change. He was a rebel in the truest sense of the term. He fought British imperialism as much as Indian traditionalism. In the economic field, his basic philosophy lies in the fact that he questioned the relevance of the western model of development to Indian conditions.

He began the exploration of the specificity of Indian conditions and the intellectual quest for an economic and social model which takes cognizance of Indian conditions. We must be wise enough to recognise that the Mahatma represents the beginning and not the consummation of this quest. Of enduring value in Gandhi's thoughts is his perception of the basic problems of Indian society rather than his prescriptions for their solution. The basic point is that his fundamental perceptions and insights have relevance not only for the period to which he belonged but also for the present and future situations in India.

Let us now look at the essence of Gandhi's economic thought. Gandhi's first important contribution was to throw light on the rural-urban cleavage, the vast gulf between 750,000 villages and a few hundred towns in India. He was emphatic that the one-sided development of town-based modern industry may have only adverse effects on the village. It was bound to accentuate the existing hiatus between urban and rural areas. He also emphasized that in India, for a long time to come, it was neither desirable nor feasible to promote urbanisation.

His second contribution was to draw attention to the preponderance of the small working peasants and artisans in the total population, as a logical corollary. Gandhi also drew attention to the vast importance of small scale agriculture and traditional handicrafts in the livelihood patterns of the overwhelming majority of the Indian people. In his view, a development model which did not give adequate importance to the im-

improvement of small scale agriculture and handicrafts, in effect gave primacy to the interests of a narrow minority at the expense of the interests of a vast majority. Above all, he stressed that modern industry would do more harm than good to these vast masses if it was not deliberately so planned to avoid encroaching upon the sphere in which small scale production was dominant.

The third basic contribution was to fix attention on the conditions of labour surplus in the Indian economy which made it irrational to intensify the application of labour-saving technology for expansion of output. It was both rational and desirable to seek maximisation of output through utilisation of surplus labour in small scale capital-and-labour-saving enterprises. An economic model based on surplus labour utilisation, in his view, would contribute simultaneously to the growth of output as well as mass welfare.

Even though the architects of our Five Year Plans did make concessions for some of Gandhi's ideas which spoke of the participation of small peasants, artisans and the landless labour in economic development, and provided for the development of small scale industry and agriculture, in effect the identification of economic progress with the development of heavy industry never permitted any serious and comprehensive operational planning for the realisation of these goals. As a result, significant progress has doubtless been achieved where it was a question of the development of a modern industrial sector or the creation of a modern sub-sector in agriculture, but as predicted by Gandhi, these developments, by and large, have failed to make a perceptible dent into mass poverty and unemployment. This situation is the root of the social tensions which have become a chronic feature of Indian society today.

The contributions of the Mahatma are of enormous significance for economic development. He rightly anticipated that in our overpopulated and agrarian society, the need for economic improvement of the masses for a long period lies along exploitation of the economic potential of family-labour in agriculture and small industry. He was also constantly on the look-out for land and capital saving technology for both agriculture and industry which help the maximisation of both income and employment. The recent advances in land-saving agricultural technology, which have held out the promise of economic efficiency of small operating units, have proceeded in a direction anticipated and desired by Gandhi.

In evaluating and assessing Gandhi's thought, it is necessary to bear in mind that he always insisted on making a distinction, and rightly too, between material advance and real progress. The affluent western world is slowly realising this truth. As a sociologist has said, 'Gandhi was a unique blend of Luther and Calvin in the Indian society'. Like Luther,

he had a deep distrust of the rising forces of materialism. Like Calver, at the same time, he made a heroic effort to reinterpret religious thought to the changing circumstances of the modern period.

If we hesitate to base our economic program, with such adaptations as may be necessary, on the gandhian philosophy, we shall be doing no more than sow the seeds of self-destruction. The corruption of character will be no less complete than the spoliation of the physical environment.

Durga Das

It is only appropriate that, true to its name, *Gandhi Marg* should invite writers in the twenty-fifth year of Gandhi's martyrdom to identify three major issues facing the country and suggest their solution, if necessary by using gandhian techniques.

Let me first state that corruption in public life is no longer the evil it was known to be during the Gandhi era.

Immorality is no longer immoral in an increasingly permissive sexual life. The lust of power and its extreme to satisfy greed and lust (three Ws) are no longer a disqualification for public office; indeed today they are considered to provide the zest for it. Labour is not the criterion for reward. In all this gandhian values may be said to have been thrown overboard.

But the picture even in its general outline will be incomplete without putting on the credit side three other parallel developments. Firstly, women who were sucked into public life by the call of Gandhi have become a growingly significant element in our public life. This is not only symbolized by the fact that a woman holds the country's Prime Ministership but also by the manner in which women are entering every sphere of public life and the more waterlogged among them are repurting the question of sex morality from orthodox notions of chastity.

Secondly, the 'Gandhi Hates' (Eradicate Poverty) slogan has created a new consciousness among the have-nots. Although it is taking on the appearance of class war it is also instilling a spirit of tolerance among the haves and a sense of self-criticism among the 'vulnerable' sections of our society.

Thirdly, the people have become conscious of the fact that an end to the clash between the haves and the have-nots and also the solution of the problem of poverty will have to be found, in the final analysis, by adopting the 'Gandhi Marg' (The Way of Gandhi)—which can be simply defined as *Sarvodaya*, the good of all. Gandhi wanted every public worker to win the confidence of all sections of the community which love alone could secure. He did not subscribe to the all too common view that the good of the people meant the good of the majority. It is the enforcement of this unjust doctrine that has confronted American

democracy with the challenge of Black Power and with the contradiction that while Americans, constituting a sixth of the world's population, own half the world's wealth, no less than 27 per cent of their people live below the poverty line!

There is hardly an evil in modern life, be it in a capitalist, communist or fascist state, which does not exist today in the public life of this country and in the personal behaviour of our citizenry. All this evil may be summarised in one dictum, 'Each one to himself'—each picking the other's pocket, each telling the other a pup and each resorting to lies and ruses to promote his personal interests alone. Perhaps the evil may also be named in modern idiom as image-building. A politician does it one way, a cinema star another way and a whore a third way. The point to be stressed is that the evil of image-building is universal. It places self above society, the community, the nation and humanity at large.

It can be argued that if every individual is engaged in self-improvement or self-fulfilment it should total up to a better world than the one in which there are masters and slaves, haves and have-nots, the mighty and the downtrodden. Yes, the struggle for survival does create a movement leading to an upheaval and humanity, in the final count, benefits by such a changing of the scene.

All epics, including the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, illustrate the situation in which India and the world at large find themselves. Violence and terrorism is daily recorded in all parts of the world excluding India, so also discoveries of science and technology. We also have a lot of people, westerners in particular, in search of gurus. There is a general feeling that old religions, their precepts and their rituals do not quench the thirst of the modern man and woman for a freer, fuller and more meaningful life.

The politician thinks he is meeting the challenge by uttering mouthfuls of slogans and employing a series of gimmicks, the businessman and the trader feel they are playing up to the seller's market by multiplying their wares by fair or foul means; the petty official thinks he is helping himself and his clients by charging a fee for services rendered; the top executive thinks he is serving himself and the nation by exploiting the market; the politician assumes he is doing nothing wrong by taking a cut in gains he helps businessmen to make and the public official to pocket.

All this is a tale of selfish behaviour. There is no such thing as law and order, honesty in dealings between man and man or commitment to labour for earning one's living. It may be said that if this goes on there would be chaos and life and living would be impossible.

The fact is that the people of the world, and certainly of India, have learned to co-exist with poverty, tyranny and corruption. The common people theoretically still value honesty, simplicity, godliness, social service

and humanness. But they model their behaviour on that of others who are on the higher rungs of the ladder.

There is no democracy in India because our rulers have built their appeal on caste and catered to the egotistic impulses under a feudal order. There is no socialism because the current philosophy is based on the 'Heads I win and tails you lose' mentality. There is no law and order because the establishment sets a bad example by breaking it in its own interest. And the consequence is the raj of the goondas and the hoodlums.

Modern India was blessed with a *triumvirat*—the Gandhi-Patel-Nehru Triumvirate. All three are dead but they have left an imperishable legacy. Gandhi taught love and truth. Patel showed how human beings must discipline themselves to fulfil the godhuman message. Nehru crusaded against false gods and images and named new gods—science, technology and the agitational concept. We thus have in them the creator, the preserver, the destroyer—all three are an inseparable part of our heritage. If only researchers would make a primer of the thoughts of this modern triad we would successfully fight the triple evil of corruption, maladministration and self-aggrandisement.

R. R. Diwakar

Four socialist dreamers dreamt about free India, each in his own way. The dreams were not inconsistent with one another, nor were they contradictory. Perhaps the four together gave a grand conception of an India that can be, could the dreams but be shaped into reality—not by a magic wand, but by realistic vision combined with imaginative adjustment, and hard solving by India's millions for practical results.

Lokamanya Tilak who passed away in 1920 made India aggressively vocal in the demand for *Swaraj* as a birthright. He formed what was called the Democratic *Swaraj* Party at the end of his days. He and his followers wanted India to be as free as England, and as democratic as Britain in their sheltered island.

Sri Aurobindo, though a contemporary of Tilak, wanted India to be free not merely as any other country, but for rising to its original and earlier spiritual heights and to be the *Guru* of the world. He aimed at a synthesis by India of the two emphases of east and west, on spiritualism and materialism, and in the bargain, taking the next step in human evolution, thereby raising man to super-manhood, not of the Nietzschean brand but one which could be truth-conscious, love-inspired and with power to transform even matter to higher and subtler levels. He pointed to Integral Yoga as the path.

Gandhi wanted India not to follow the West in its mad rush after materialising the needs of the sensate man. He would follow the line of the

ethical man and not that of the ever-expanding economic man, who would perforce be an exploiter of man and nature. He aimed at raising the level, physical, mental and moral, of rural India that is the real India, more than anything else.

Jawaharlal Nehru wanted India to be modern in every sense of the term and could not imagine how India could live and progress without being industrialised in the accepted sense of the term. Big factories, hydro works and such other things were the new 'temples' which were calculated to bring prosperity and peace to India and the world. He gave the slogan 'Democratic Socialism', that is, economic growth at a rapid pace with social and economic justice as a necessary concomitant, but all this to be achieved by democratic methods of the western type.

Gandhi's dream has come true, practically in toto. Sri Aurobindo's dream requires a far longer time to materialise. Freedom has come as a result of putting into vigorous practice the kind of non-cooperation he envisaged in his political will and testament as early as 1916, when he chose to go to French India and concentrate on the practice of Integral Yoga.

Thinkers and philosophers in the West are now being impressed by the spiritual content of Indian thought and practice. Paramahansa Yogananda, Vivekananda, Ramana Maharshi, Swami Shivananda, Chattanya Mahaprabhu and Sri Aurobindo himself are being studied more and more. The physical and vital aspects of Yoga are normally more attractive to the West. It is only recently that meditation, the most important aspect of Yoga, is being attended to under the influence of Paramahansa Yogananda, Maharshi Maheshi Yoga and others. But one thing is clear, that the importance of human consciousness and its control for reaching higher levels is now being realised more and more in the West. That way lies real human evolution and not through science and technology as understood in a limited sense, and as confined to the realm of physics and chemistry, with the test-tube as the main instrument and the laboratory as the temple.

Gandhi is today being studied both in India and abroad as a counter-balance to the modern trends of over-industrialisation, pollution, alienation, violence, urbanisation and so on. His emphasis on rural India still occupies the minds of the planners in our Government. But his modest economics, his ethics, his faith in God and his greater faith in the masses, his ideas of planning from below and at the grass roots, his simplicity, his nonviolence—these do not seem to attract much attention. The policy of prohibition he advocated is yielding to the lure of easy excise revenue which governments get at the cost of sobriety and the economies of the poor man. The techniques which he evolved during the struggle for freedom are being used without the essential controlling factors of truthfulness, honesty and the strictest possible nonviolence to

thought, word and deed. His aim at a classless and classless society is being negatived by a number of things; political power is often enough pursued on the basis of religion, community and caste, and elections bring up casteism as an important factor for success. There is a cold war raging between employers and employees and it has converted itself into a struggle for power instead of only for economic benefits. All the planning has merely made the rich richer, and the poor poorer. Unemployment and backwardness have increased no doubt, but the extension of the period of privileges has created a vested interest in backwardness. The movements of Bhootan, Qalandar and others in the gandhian tradition have made a psychological dent, no doubt. But the problems of land and village politics have not changed very much except in some areas. A newspaper reader in India may feel that there is no rural India at all, as all news pertains to towns and cities.¹

As regards modernisation, India is certainly modernising fast and the twenty-five years of independence have seen many significant changes in that direction. Whether one likes all the features of modernisation or not, we are in an escalator. The globe today is like a single ship afloat or a satellite set going round the sun with 3600 million passengers—and they have to be able substantially with some local variations. India may require another quarter of a century to industrialise and urbanise as much as Japan or Germany but the trend is unmistakable and perhaps the course is inevitable. It was not merely Jawaharlal's fancy that he thought of modernisation. He was with the times and saw early enough that it was inevitable—of course, with such restraints as were necessary and such variations as were dictated by Indian traditions and conditions.

With all these things behind and before us, what are the social problems that we are facing? Seventy per cent of our people are illiterate. We cannot boast of being a modern people with this load of illiteracy, with no tool in the hands of the people to know what is going on all around. Forty per cent of our people are below the poverty line, that is, they are living on less than twenty rupees a month. There is a poverty line in U.S.A. also, but the line there means two thousand rupees per month—only one hundred times more than India! And the number of such people in U.S.A. is estimated to be not more than ten per cent, whereas it is forty per cent here! Nothing less than a mighty national effort, not merely by the Government but by the whole people, inspired by an intense awareness among the educated and those who have, to share their knowledge and wealth with others, can be a remedy for this other physical and mental poverty.

Apart from the drought situation in some areas this year in India, the problem of unemployment and under-employment is acute. Decentralisation of industries and promotion of labour-intensive industries and works in rural areas seem to be the only remedy. But here again, the

awareness of duty and responsibility as well as the simple principle of 'no wages without work' and without adequate production, has to be realised by each individual as well as by the community as a whole. All other remedies can be defeated by lethargy and non-awareness of these responsibilities.

The whole Indian scene, no doubt, looks rather confused and difficult to handle. But we must remember that all the dissatisfaction and the insistence of every action to have its pound of flesh is due only to two things: First, the new awakening among the high and low of their real or imagined rights and the absence of the equally important sense of duty and responsibility that must precede the fulfilment of all rights. Secondly, the want of realism and of the realisation that adjustments are necessary for living together. Both these imperatives must fuse together into a philosophy of life for Indians if they wish to continue as a nation among nations.

Archbishop Fernandes

Richer for the experience of last twenty-five years, India's hopes for the 'seventies are bright and real, though the challenges remain as mighty as ever. Notwithstanding our failings, weaknesses and difficulties—wars, drought, famine and floods—much has been accomplished since independence, especially in the fields of industry, agriculture, social welfare and education. Our policy of non-alignment has been proven and we have demonstrated in five General Elections that the democratic process is viable for our 335 millions.

The spirit of India drew the respect and admiration of the world when in a magnificent act of human solidarity, she came to the rescue of ten million refugees from Bangla Dosh, even as she helped that country in the battle for freedom.

Our Silver Jubilee Year has ended with the promise of a durable peace on the sub-continent and 'a feeling', in President Giri's words, 'that a new era of goodwill and friendly relations among the nations of the world has opened'. However, assets and achievements must not blind us to our liabilities and stubborn problems—rising prices, growing unemployment, political chaos, poverty, illiteracy and a decline in the growth of industrial output.

OUR IDEAL: INTEGRAL HUMANISM

The foundation of our national life, says the Preamble of the Swarajya Statement on National Integration, is a common citizenship, unity in diversity, freedom of religion, secularism, equality, justice—social, economic and political—and fraternity among all communities. That in a word is Integral Humanism—the foundation for a full human

life for each man, the whole man and all men in the country.

It means a greater sense of belonging—both to our fellowmen and to our country and her destiny. There is need for a greater spirit of compassion and unselfish service, combating the greatest social evil haunting us today—unemployment, the terrible perpetrator of poverty, discrimination and exploitation. To achieve this goal of integral humanism, there are four areas calling for disciplined attention: (1) economic growth; (2) social justice; (3) people's participation; (4) self-reliance.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

The GNP has more than doubled in the past decade and so too the area brought under irrigation. The green revolution, though it has received a set-back in 1972, is still a workable reality. And yet, notwithstanding the Five Year Plans, we are far from economic self-reliance, and may well wonder whether some re-thinking is not called for at this stage.

Some experts ask whether in a country where capital is scarce and labour plentiful, employment should not be made the target of planning and overall growth its byproduct? If big urban factories and large-farm mechanised agriculture must continue to be encouraged, does this preclude active attention to small producers in farming and many categories of industry? The poor can certainly pay the cost of their own improvement, as can be gauged, for example, from the rising rates of the small farmers in Taiwan. The human effort needs to be supplemented, not replaced, by reliable machines.

Similarly, capital intensive industries are needed in a large country like ours, but side by side still greater stress could perhaps be given to small industry—the more so as the amount of capital needed to increase production in this way is limited.

Consistent with our goals of non-alignment and social justice, should not the private sector also be more significantly encouraged along the above lines? Increased production must certainly be given a big boost in the 'seventies'.

SOCIAL JUSTICE

The distribution of GNP is greatly influenced by the manner of its production. If GNP is produced by many, people in general will share in the material benefits of economic growth, whereas if it is hoarded by a few, the gap between rich and poor will continue to widen.

Our aim should be to become a fully employed economy. Income distribution must be embedded in growth policies. That half of India's population which owns only four per cent of the land and can lay claim to less than a rupee a day for their needs will only be able to have flesh in the 'Garibi Hatao' program when they themselves are bringing a

about

PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION

This 'sense of community' as a nation is necessary as the justifying moral unit of development, even as it highlights another important issue, namely, people's participation in the development process, their sharing in production and in its fruits and in the power to make the decisions that matter. Preserving law and order is one thing, bringing about the development needed in the country is another. Our administrative system could certainly do with some streamlining suited to our post-colonial needs. Abolishing the zamindar was a blessing to the harassed poor, but has not the contractor or some other middle-man effectively replaced him? The bottlenecks operative at various levels of the administrative machinery are not tributes to the spirit of 'service' expected of those especially who live on the taxes of the people. Production often suffers because a worker does not experience any job satisfaction and that in turn is due to his having no say in what is produced, its subsequent marketing and his lack of purchasing power to bring any sizeable benefit to his family from what he produces at work.

SELF-RELIANCE

Self-reliance can only come about along the above lines when development becomes a movement of the masses. Some hard political decisions need to be taken so that there is real freedom and joy in work in all sectors of life not excluding the university. If the lure of money and the greed for power continue to keep millions of the work force in a state of effective subordination, the prospects for self-reliance grow dimmer. The educational system needs to be overhauled so that the types it can produce are not hireable self-seekers or just skilled workers at the mercy of others, but people who know the meaning of responsible living, their rights and duties in society, the need for responsible parenthood and family life education, people who are concerned about the one million destitute in the country, the poor and the underprivileged whom they consider it a privilege to serve.

The school and college system must be geared to generating this social consciousness even while it imparts training for individual betterment and moral values.

This brings us to the vital question of motivation and the re-making of man. The world is all right; it is man who is in crisis in our country.

Student indiscipline, for instance, is only the manifestation of a generation denied mental and moral training, encouraged in disorderly behaviour by the present conduct of examinations and the role of some unscrupulous mercenaries therein, the disregard of ethical principles in practical life by grown-ups, the grant of material success to persons of

doubtful academic standards, the expediency of politicians—or administrators-turned-educationalists. Nothing is more urgent than 'the discipline' necessary for modern development, for that combination of knowledge of technique and the ability to apply it in a human context demanded by the challenges of life today.

Drawing on the heritage of the past and harmonising it with the best the modern world has to offer, we can and must move ahead confidently to the future. It is in and through the blend of the wisdom of the seers, the motivation and dynamism latent in all the religions in our land, the culture of the philosophers and artists, the courage and integrity of the heroes of our freedom struggle, the true grittiness and selfless spirit of Gandhi and Nehru and the expertise of the technocrat, in a word, it is through the integration of authentic religious and ethical values with science and technology that India has a real contribution to make to the betterment of her citizens and to the world at large.

Gandhi's appeal to his countrymen is as telling today as it was when he uttered it two days before his death. 'Each of us should turn the searchlight inward and purify his or her heart as much as possible. You should think how best to improve yourselves and work for the good of the country.'

Devendra Kumar Gupta

Like any other country on the world map, India is maddled with multi-faceted problems. The dark shadows of its problems show more acutely in the early hours of the rising sun of 1973. Of these, the three most important seem to me to be; (1) The law and order problem. There is pandemonium in many quarters and tension is mounting at various points. Due to diverse causes a general feeling of stress prevails. (2) There is a great depression, psychologically, because of the gap between peoples' aspirations and achievements not having been bridged. Both in the rural as well as the urban sectors the picture of the underprivileged is very bleak. (3) We are passing through a crucial stage in our relations with other countries and there is a lurking danger of India getting isolated amidst the changing equations of the political equilibrium of the world.

POLITICAL PROSC

Firstly, there is the law and order situation in the country, i.e., the problem of unrest that is evident everywhere and which erupts into conflagration now and then. Crystallising at the moment in the geography of unrest are the issue of Telangana in Andhra Pradesh, the tussle between the DMK and the Anna DMK in Tamilnadu, students' unrest in the campuses of the northern universities, and the problems resulting from

the continued struggles between political parties and groups in all the states. All these and many more are symptoms of a deep-seated malady in the structure of our society. Its basic cause could be traced to the political process of decision making based on majority. The criterion that democracy is to be judged by the security it provides to the minority hardly finds expression in these days of competitive political struggles. Unless, therefore, a method is found to make the democratic system rise above the rule of artificial majority, the situation is going to be no better than what it is today.

The Indian electorate is not so docile and uneducated as it is made out to be. It does react against, and register its needs about, the various pulls and pressures that are brought to bear upon it by the political cross-currents which sweep the country. From 1947 onwards the masses of India have tried out diverse experiments in the pattern of the ruling group; and by all accounts such experimentation will continue to proceed forward. This is a healthy sign and needs to be appreciated and encouraged.

If we can obtain some confidence in the people that they could experiment also on such methods where an artificial majority exists to be the only criterion of the collective decision-making process, we may move forward. It is the rigidity and fallacy of considering 51 per cent to be supreme and 49 per cent to be equivalent to zero which is at the root of all our present unrest. The spirit of accommodating the interests of all the concerned sections in the decision-making process finds no compulsion in the rules by which our political life is being regulated. This leads to an expression of distrust, desperation and ultimately of violence on the part of the vanquished group. It is necessary, therefore, that whenever conflicting interests are involved, instead of resorting to a mathematical counting of votes, a method of arriving at a consensus based on a commonly acceptable decision should be initiated. With the mounting magnitude of our problems and the increasing complexity of life, the consensus experiment will have to be progressively evolved if we do not want to be bogged down amidst the hurdles that will be created by those on whose coast the majority will tread. Therefore whenever a collective decision has to be taken, whether it is for choosing a representative or for arriving at an executive policy resolution, the method of determining the majority should gradually be so widened as to include the maximum number of interests represented. The sooner and faster we move in this direction the quicker will we be able to find a peaceful solution for the pacifism that prevails.

In this regard, there ought to be the following experiments started immediately, once the need as enunciated above is recognised.

(1) A method of elections in which all sections of the electorate would feel that the candidate will be chosen through collective choice

and not through a combination of groups out-manoeuvring the rest. The experiments in Yugoslavia of 'veteran' councils and the like must be explored and, after adjusting them to the situation in our country, given a trial.

(2) Even if the first step takes time, the decision-making bodies should try to evolve a formula by which their decisions will become more broad-based instead of being based on a simple majority. A differential scale could be evolved whereby the degree of importance of a decision would determine the percentage by which it is to be taken. In cases which touch the life of all people, the method of consensus should be evolved in such a way that a decision becomes the decision of the whole group, not only of those who are in its favour but also of those who choose to oppose it. This method could be tried out in smaller elected bodies like the village council, the municipality, the corporation and various voluntary agencies, and ultimately brought up to the level of the State Assemblies and the National Parliament.

(3) Even if the first two steps take time to find expression, there is need for common programs of action through which political parties and groups could jointly work out common projects of public weal—be it in the field of economic development, political action or cultural expression. The more numerous such areas of common action, the easier it will be to break barriers and open up avenues of mutual understanding, which will then form the base for any experimentation on structural political change.

ECONOMIC PACE

Secondly, let us consider the most tragic of the situations in our economic field. Even after 25 years of self-rule, we have not been able to raise the 40 per cent of our population who live below the subsistence level. The rise in GNP has not improved the conditions of the down-trodden so much as it has helped the upper class. Gandhi's stress on strengthening the weakest link has eluded our efforts so far, and that is why the country has resoundingly supported the need for a 'Gandhi Hina' movement.

To move in this direction, it is necessary that the productivity of the poorer classes should be immediately attended to and that is the priority of things they should have the foremost claim to whatever resources the country has of talents, money, material or men. The usual compulsions of the market rule of demand and supply should not be allowed to have their way in the matter of our priorities, if poverty is to be eradicated. Due to historical reasons, the elite and the ruling class, along with what is called the middle class, has been keeping a distance from the 70 to 80 per cent of our people who earn by the sweat of their labour. A complete change is, therefore, necessary in the attitude of the elite, and

methods should be immediately found out by which the lowest strata of our society could be helped. The sorrowful situation is that out of the 100 million families which constitute the Indian population, some two to three millions have to go to bed without dinner. Some time or the other of the year ten million families experience the pangs of hunger. Hence it is imperative that before we attempt to do anything else we must assure ourselves that none in the land is obliged to sleep without meals. To have a national insurance against hunger, every locality, from a small village to a great city, must assure that its inhabitants are secure in their need for food. For this purpose it is necessary to start small industries or places of work where anybody who has no employment could come and work, and receive for his family at least two kilos of grain for eight hours of labour. This has become possible through the opening of small units of *Ambar Charkha*, which can be easily plyed by even a child or an old man. Spinning on this *charkha* gives an income of 15 paise per hank. Other methods also could be found out by which those who could not be provided with work, in spite of their eagerness to work, are given some subsistence wage to keep body and soul together. All this calls for planning from the bottom upwards. Therefore, 1973 should be a year of awakening—to our duty towards the poor of the land how to bring about relief to hungry bellies.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Now the third point is in regard to our international relations. Unlike any other country in the world, India stands out as a beacon for those who want to remain outside the arena of the conflicting super powers which are trying to carve the world into areas of influence. She should continue to refuse to be tied to the apronstrings of any of the big bullies and prove by her example that pressures of security and helplessness will not make this country subservient to another—politically, economically or culturally. Twenty-five years of maturing through various vicissitudes have steeled the will and broadened the vision of India. The year 1973 should, therefore, see that the self-reliance for which our country stands is expressed unmistakably through our political and economic policies. Dependence in any one of the three fields—political, economic or cultural—will lead to dependence in the other two fields also.

To be able to find an expression to our *svadharma*, India will have to rely economically on its own resources. Other countries may be asked to help in a peripheral way but the burden of the reliance will be on our own. If the assistance ever assumes a magnitude whereby our self-reliance is decreased, we would be placing the reins of our conscience, to that extent, in the hands of the one on whom we rely. A strategy will have to be worked out by which cultural reliance on the spiritual growth

and historical dynamics of our country is integrated with our present economy. For this to be economically feasible, instead of relying too much on external aid, or even on trade to increase our foreign exchange earnings, all of which leads to a vicious cycle in which we being the weaker are always on the losing side of the game, our effort should be to rely more and more on our own resources. The very process of earning foreign exchange, through the export of traditional articles of agriculture or manufactured goods, merely helps the affluent sector of our society to get richer, and to get closer to the privileged population of the world, thus alienating it from the maligned millions of our land. Even if we do not want to align with or copy any particular political system evolved elsewhere, our economic and cultural dependence will miserably prompt us to toe the political line of the country on which we depend.

India must try to look at all the international problems in their right perspective, without being influenced by the big powers, and even at the risk of being a minority, she must proclaim what is good for the community of nations. The envoys of India abroad will act differently when they cease to be bargainers for national interests and become ambassadors of goodwill and peace, working for the downtrodden and the weak. Then they will help the world to feel at one. The heritage of the Buddha and Gandhi, which India represents, will be meaningless if this country, with one-sixth of the world's population, is not able to gradually diffuse its peaceful influence over the five continents and help in bringing together the forces of humanity which express themselves in the concept of the Family of Man. Our past history, our present hesitant steps and our future destiny demand that we move forward and become a force for peace in the world.

Harekrishna Mohan

To have an idea of the problems which are likely to face the country in 1973, it is necessary to look back a little and see how things have developed since 1971. The year 1971 will be known in history as the year in which a major division took place in the Congress and a new Congress was born out of the old one. Hopes ran high and the entire population moved with an emotion which could be compared with that of 1931, when Gandhi initiated the non-cooperation movement. As that movement showed a way out of the then existing inertia, the movement which the new Congress has started under the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi appeared to point out a way to break the inertia which had engulfed the country. Both Indian and foreign observers clearly noticed the stagnation in the Indian society as if everything had come to a standstill. The new Congress corrected the situation and people started moving with high hopes. The unprecedented victory on the battle-front

and also on the political front confirmed the hope that a new situation was in the offing. The situation, as it was generally visualized, was that the masses would receive due consideration in the formulation of all governmental policies. The slogan was almost the same as it had been during the gandhian period. Gandhi used to emphasize the point that all governmental policies must keep in view the poorest and the least-advanced sections of the country. The same slogan was raised in 1971 but the terms used were different. The slogan of 1971 was democratic socialism. As it was difficult for the common people to know the distinction between *swaraj* and complete independence, to resolve it Gandhi translated the latter term as '*purna swaraj*'. It was similarly difficult for the common people to know the distinction between socialism as it is understood in the wide world and the raising of the common mass to the status of honour and prosperity as was conceived by Gandhi. The fact, however, is that the masses understood socialism in the manner conceived by Gandhi. Therefore they expected that their problems would be the main concern of the Government in the formulation of its policies. Victory in Bangla Desh wiped out the complex which grew after the defeat in NEFA. Nationalization of banks, abolition of proxy parities, etc. confirmed the hope that at least the attention of the Government would definitely turn towards the masses rather than the classes. The year 1971 ended with this hope.

The year 1972 was the year in which all the hopes were put to test. In spite of the glory achieved in the military and political fields, failures occurred on the economic front. Shortage of food and other essential articles and an abnormal rise in prices hit hard the common people. On the other hand, there was no indication of control on the expenditure not only of the Government but also of the classes benefited by governmental plans. Clearly two classes emerged in 1972—one enormously benefited by the Five Year Plans and the other deriving little or no profit from these plans. While shortage of essential goods and rise in prices affected the second class they did not affect the first at all. In this connection, one's mind goes back to the gandhian period when the movement of non-cooperation started. In all countries, and under all types of governments, there naturally grows a beneficiary class which derives benefits directly or indirectly from all governmental plans and activities. Discontent in the other class gradually grows and, ultimately, that discontented class overwhelms Government and their beneficiaries. Gandhi gave the lead to that non-beneficiary class in those days. The difference between the situation existing then and now is that the size of the beneficiary class then was much smaller than what it is now. Today, beginning from the villages to the cities, the beneficiary class has grown to such a size as could hardly be conceived in the pre-independence days. Even so the size of the non-beneficiary class continues to be

much larger than the beneficiary one. The discontent in this class has been growing since 1972. On one side, there is no indication of voluntary sacrifice of comforts while, on the other, there is enforced sacrifice and suffering. The principle of identification with the masses, which Gandhi advocated for the benefit of both the classes and the masses, has now been completely forgotten and given up. Therefore, there does not seem to be any possibility of a leadership growing in the class of the beneficiaries to regulate and harness the discontent in the non-beneficiary class. This is the reason that disorganised violence is on the increase all over the country. The same situation was there before Gandhi came on the scene in 1920.

However, even now all the hopes of the people are not gone, but they are fast receding. Unless the problems of the masses become the main concern of all governmental plans, discontent will grow; but, in the absence of proper leadership, there will be disorganised violence on the one hand and forced pathetic contentment on the other. These are the problems which the year 1975 is likely to face. The problems can be summarised as follows: (1) The common people do not think that they are the main concern of all the plans which are made for the country. (2) The classes which are benefited by the governmental plans do not exhibit any preparedness to come down and share the difficulties of the common people. (3) The leadership required for calling upon the classes to sacrifice for the masses does not appear to be existing today.

The picture, therefore, appears to be gloomy, but the solution seems to lie in to begin somewhere with some people, whatever their number may be. First, there must be some people to represent the masses properly even at the risk of incurring the displeasure of the authorities who are in a position to distribute favours and patronage. Providing leadership to the non-beneficiary class is a job which should attract youth even though in small numbers. The leadership must be well acquainted with the gandhian technique which alone can succeed in achieving the desired results.

K.R. Maikani

Our biggest single problem in India is that we just don't know what we are and where we want to go. There is no clear sense of direction.

Every country has a measure of itself; and every country assumes a role that, it thinks, is appropriate to itself. Thus for example the U.S kept expanding from the original 13 colonies because it thought it was its 'manifest destiny' to reach the Pacific and beyond.

Although Russia was always way behind other powers, it decided centuries ago that it had to be a great power. Through the efforts of

from the Terrible, Peter the Great and Lenin it has at last attained that status.

China pretends not to be interested in great power status. But no other country is more status conscious. The mandarin-turned-communists still look upon their country as a kind of Middle Kingdom. Just think of the way President Nixon was ushered into Chairman Mao's presence. It is significant that Marshal Chen-Yi, when he was Foreign Minister, once said: 'We will go without pants, if necessary, but we will make the nuclear bomb.'

Other countries also have, from time to time, aspired to, and attained, a status appropriate to their size, resources and opportunities. India is perhaps the only major country with a large size and a huge population which has not yet decided where it wants to go and what it wants to become. It only talks of peace among nations and goodwill among men without realising that a sermon is not a policy.

Actually, a big country like ours has to become strong and great if it does not want to break up. An impotent leviathan is not a very viable creature. It has to develop power to match its size or it will disintegrate. I think we should overcome our shyness and make it clear that our size, our resources and our civilisation entitle us to great power status. As Dr Panikkar used to say, we should declare the area from Aden to Singapore as our sphere of influence and see that nothing adverse to our interests takes place there. We must also smash the atom—and smash our way to a permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. A course like that will give this country a goal to live for and die for. It will make India a major and independent power centre in the world. It will bring about a qualitative change over everything in the country.

However, nations do not become great for the asking. A nation has to be convinced of its greatness before it can become great. And here the issue of identity comes in. That is the second basic issue of our times.

Centuries of morale and foreign rule have distorted our personality. We ourselves are in *doubt* about our own identity. The result is a dichotomy running all through our lives. We spend astronomical sums on a nuclear program to become modern, and then stop short of producing the nuclear bomb—maybe on grounds of its excessive violence. We declare Hindi the 'national language', and then forget all about it—in the name of English as a 'subsidiary language'. We subsidise the *charkha* and wear *kurtyas*. Many of the men who praise basic education send their children all the way to missionary schools. We don't even seem to be sure whether our country is India, Bharat or Hindustan.

The Indian state today is Indian only in name; it is Anglo-Indian in its thinking and living. This alienates it from the masses and makes

is a parasitic class. It also makes it suspect in the eyes of proud nations like the Japanese and the French, who have come to look upon us as imitation Englishmen.

For all these reasons the establishment of our identity in all spheres of life has become a must. I wish Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* were made compulsory study in colleges. If this country is to discover itself and grow to greatness, it will have to decide, sooner rather than later, to put English on par with other major foreign languages for purposes of study—and make do with Indian languages, in whatever permutation or combination. That will immediately unshackle the Indian mind and remove the biggest single hurdle in the way of Indian resurgence.

This pride in *swadeshi* will have to be carried into all spheres of activity. Everybody complains about allopathy but almost everybody hangs on to it. By contrast, the Chinese have reserved acupuncture which, whatever its therapeutic value, has a Chinese identity, and a Chinese pride, built into it. Everybody complains of the law's delays and the high cost of justice—and yet there are no plans to revise the law in the light of Indian experience. Ancient Indian architecture has produced some of the wonders of the world—and yet there is no effort to apply these principles to modern building materials.

Only a firm belief in the value of the Indian way of life, and in the validity of the Indian view of life, can give people the mental and moral courage to stand up and build this country. Demoralized elements might dismiss this as chauvinism, but the fact is that only fierce patriotism can generate enough motive power to transform this country into something worth while. An upsurge like this will act as a solvent for all our other problems—whether of caste, class or region, of illiteracy, ill health or poverty.

And that brings me to the third major issue—less basic but more concrete—of our times, namely, economic growth. National identity and national power cannot grow in a climate of zero economic growth. Indeed national lassitude itself is a major factor in economic stagnation.

I need not go here into all that is wrong with the Indian economy. Suffice it to say that the economy should be oriented to production and not to politics. Anything that maximizes production must be encouraged regardless of whether it adds to, or detracts from, the politician's power or patronage.

By the same criterion, the war of nations must end and the entire economy should be treated as a national sector. The Government has demoralized the decent entrepreneur by defaming all businessmen and at the same time allowed corrupt black-millionaires to crop up. The Planning Commission itself is manned by theoreticians and politicians, with not a single person having any experience of any branch of the economy. While the Government blames the God of rain for crop

failures, it has no explanation for industrial stagnation and financial mismanagement, high prices and high taxes.

I am afraid the Government of a developing country cannot be a party or group affair. It has to be a national enterprise in which all citizens see themselves as willing participants. Gandhi fully understood this mission when he saw to it that distinguished non-Congressmen like Dr Shyama Prasad Mukherjee and Dr Ambedkar were inducted into the first national Government. The aster one by one of these distinguished non-Congressmen quickly reduced the Government of India to an appendix of the Congress organisation, which in turn became an appendix of the man in power. Other parties find themselves excluded from all avenues of power and responsibility. They can hardly be blamed for gloating over the failures of a Government which never gives them credit for anything.

While parties—and elections on party basis—will, and must, go on, there should be a clear understanding among all parties that building India is not a party enterprise but a national enterprise, a yajna, in which all significant sections of society must have their due share. This is not a plea for a coalition Government. But this certainly is a plea for a Government of national consensus, manned by national talents, whose performance will be a matter of pride for the whole nation and whose problems would be regarded as national problems to be nationally handled. If a Republican U.S. President can include Democrats in his team, why can't a Congress Prime Minister include non-Congressmen in her Cabinet?

D.R. Maskekar

If Gandhi were alive today and were to survey the Indian scene, these things will pain him most. For twenty-five years ago, when he departed from us, he had set this country along a course that would have led us, not perhaps to 'outrageous fortune', but to genuine progress and a truly better life.

If today the promised progress and better life are eluding our grasp and we are worse off than ever before, Gandhi would certainly attribute it to three major evils the country is afflicted with: (a) high corruption that has vitiated the very roots of the country's political and economic life; (b) an alarming erosion of the rule of law, which is the very plank and foundation of a democratic and civilised life; and (c) a shocking lack of integrity in our public life, packed as it is with politicians who are worshippers of the birth-goddess called 'Vote Bank' and who feel no qualms in sacrificing the country's interests at the altar of self-promotion and party strategy.

Also, in the last twenty-five years, whatever social discipline the Great

Leader bequeathed to his people had disappeared. And the most precious gift—the rule of law—of the departing British rulers, has been squandered and disrupted by their successors. So much so, the country is reverting to the jungle—the jungle that was India in the late eighteenth century when the British stepped in.

In pursuit of the cult of the bitch-goddess Vata Mata, the politicians have bred a people that know no responsibilities but only rights, and who at the slightest provocation take their grievances to the streets; where labour leaders vie with one another in egging on workers to demand higher and higher wages for less and less work, while shying to tell them the brutal truth that only hard work and higher productivity could bring the workers real better wages and the country economic progress. Indeed, this competitive trade unionism has put a premium on dishonesty and malfeasant among workers.

Gandhi set great store by truth, right conduct, honesty and simple living which guaranteed to the people an orderly, settled life, where the meekest and the weakest would automatically find justice, and where leaders would be fashioned in his own image and be humane and human, bending down to wipe the tears and bind the wounds of the sick and the suffering.

The Mahatma was not very much concerned with the statistics of economic growth and GNP, for he knew that all these things would follow automatically if a nation adhered to the basic values—the values that ultimately sustain a nation and give it the intrinsic internal strength, which goes by the term 'strength of character', so essential even for material progress and which, in the context of a nation, means a clean public life, with leaders inspired by a sense of duty and sacrifice, a responsible citizenry, and an industrious people imbued with social discipline. To a nation armed with these virtues no Five Year Plan target is impossible of attainment.

But if after twenty-five years of independence, the Indian nation lacks these very essential preconditions for growth and progress and is stagnating, economically and socially, who is responsible for it? The blame has to be squarely laid at the door of the leadership that has been in exclusive charge of the country's affairs all these twenty-five years.

Only the leadership can foster and nurture those vital virtues among the people. For people are so much clay that in the hands of an effective leadership could be moulded into a great nation, but in the hands of an indifferent leadership would go to seed. Gandhi had the qualities that could mould a nation to greatness.

Three decades ago Chiang Kai-Shek's China was dubbed 'a nation of coolies', lazy, degenerate and corrupt. But overnight, the new leadership under Mao Tse-tung transmuted the Chinese people into an industrious, disciplined, proud nation, where nobody accepted a up nor spat

in the street, and everybody worked hard and was socially responsible. In twenty-three years, China is not only a changed, but a different nation—thanks entirely to an honest, public-spirited and efficient leadership.

In 1949, when the Mao regime took over, India was ahead of China in many ways, particularly in terms of industrialisation and communication. Populationwise and in mass poverty, China was even worse off. But today Mao's China has forged far ahead of India. Why?

Which reminds me of Stalin's quip to Churchill during the last World War. When Churchill boasted of the virtues of democracy and individual liberty, Stalin curled his lip in disdain and retorted: 'What liberty? The liberty to sit on a Hyde Park bench and starve?'

Such was also the retort of the Communist Chinese when the Americans shed tears for them on their 'loss of liberty', following the installation of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. Their only freedom till then consisted of the right to starve and get forcibly conscripted to fight and die in the wars of the notorious warlords of China.

Such might as well be the searing reply of the common man in India—to whom the concept of individual liberty is purely chimerical, and grinding poverty is the only reality.

"Enough is enough" is the present mood of the people, finding vent in widespread violence in the country in the shape of student riots and regional strife, unable to identify the faceless, impersonal travesties of present-day government.

Goaded by the 'revolution of rising expectations' and maddened by the subsequent 'revolution of rising frustrations' generated by a corrupt, inefficient and selfish leadership, the people may soon opt for 'guliti kalao *here and now*' as against the 'jam tomorrow' promised by democracy. In other words, they may choose the very tempting short-cut to progress—the short-cut of dictatorship, communism or fascism.

The glaring and ever-widening disparity between the rich and the poor, and the ever-worsening living conditions and day-to-day harassment from a corrupt officialdom, may drive people to desperate remedies. What is going on in the Philippines is the warning on the wall to those in our country who think they could get away with it all and continue to draw the wool over the eyes of the people.

Thus the supreme task before the country in the new year is tackling in good earnest the three evils named at the outset of this article, from which spring all the troubles the country is today suffering from. That task brooks no delay.

Shrinani Narayan

In my view, two crucial questions which must be answered categorically in India during 1973 are (1) what is the nature of Indian socialism,

which is sought to be established by the Government of India² and (2) which educational reforms are absolutely essential for liquidating unemployment and underemployment among the youth?

I have no manner of doubt that socialism in India must be a 'golden mean' between free enterprise and totalitarian regimentation. In other words, it cannot be either laissez faire or communism. India is the first country in the world which has launched an ambitious program of economic planning under a democratic structure. In consequence, the experience gained in the western democracies or the communist countries will not be of much avail to us. India's socialism cannot, then, be a carbon copy of the 'socialist pattern' followed in other countries. She must evolve her own type of socialism in conformity with the basic principles of her democratic Constitution. The Five Year Plans have been trying to formulate various programs in accordance with the Directive Principles of the Indian Constitution over the last two decades. Indian socialism should continue to follow, by and large, the same pattern in the coming decades with firmness and determination.

The present climate of uncertainty has been doing incalculable harm to India's economic growth and development. It is, therefore, imperative for the Government of India to announce its economic policy in the clearest terms without delay and then stick to it at least for the next ten or fifteen years. In the absence of such a clear-cut policy, further flow of investment, both in agriculture as well as industry, is bound to dry up and hamper national growth. It is true that our economic plans must be progressive in nature, and should extend direct assistance with a sense of emergency to the weakest sections of the population. But equality and justice need not be achieved at the cost of liberty and fraternity. The Preamble to our Constitution guarantees all these four fundamental values and we must accord equal sanctity and importance to all of them.

According to me, the objectives of Indian socialism should be: (1) full employment, (2) maximum production, (3) equitable distribution, and (4) self-reliance. For ensuring full employment, India must evolve her own technology of an intermediate nature which will have to be more labour-intensive than the western-type of technology which is labour-saving. In India, capital is scarce and labour abundant; in the highly developed countries like America, labour is scarce and capital abundant. Trying to imitate and import western technology into India is, therefore, bound to be a frustrating experience, leading to unemployment and waste of manpower. That is why Gandhi passionately pleaded for 'production by the masses' in place of 'mass production'. This could be attained only through a network of decentralized agro industries in the Indian countryside. It does not mean that there is no place for heavy or big industries in Indian socialism. The essential point is that most of the consumer

goods industries should be in the decentralised sector and provide gainful employment to the masses alongside agriculture, animal husbandry and dairying.

Full employment without maximum production would also be an exercise in futility. These two objectives must be attained simultaneously through improved technology which absorbs labour instead of ousting it. Unless India is able to augment her production in agriculture as well as industry at a fast rate, it would be impossible to ensure minimum standards of living to the millions who are today groaning under poverty and unemployment. As indicated earlier, a clear articulation of economic policy by the Government of India is a must for instilling confidence among the agriculturists as also the entrepreneurs.

For achieving equitable distribution, the order of priorities in the Five Year Plans will have to undergo a radical change. We must try to produce and supply food, cloth and housing to the masses at reasonable rates and in sufficient quantities. As a consequence, the production of fashionable consumer articles and luxuries for the richer classes must be curbed with a firm hand. First things must come first, the rest can follow in due course in accordance with the availability of national resources. The traditional theory of 'percolation' is now dead as a dodo; it has failed to help the poorest people at the lowest rung of the ladder. It is high time that our Plans extended direct assistance to the vulnerable segments of the population in a systematic manner.

Self-reliance is, obviously, indispensable for the rapid growth of developing countries like India. We can no longer depend on the aid of developed countries, especially the Super Powers, as such financial assistance is not likely to be available without political strings being attached to it. India, therefore, must learn to stand on her own feet and move forward on her own steam, as far as practicable. Here again, Gandhi's emphasis on self-help and self-dependence is of crucial relevance.

In regard to educational reform, the recent All India National Education Conference held at Sevagram, in the middle of October 1972, issued a 'Consensus' statement which deserves the serious attention of the Union and State Governments. Since the Conference was attended jointly by many Education Ministers, Vice-Chancellors and senior Sarvodaya workers, the statement, naturally, assumes special value and importance. I do hope that its suggestions and recommendations will be implemented without further loss of time. In brief, the educational system must be effectively linked with various programs of growth and development. Students must be trained for specific work under the Five Year Plans in accordance with manpower requirement. The examination system should undergo a radical change and there should be continuous internal assessment almost from day-to-day. Degrees should be delinked from employment and each Government department should hold its own examinations

for recruitment. There should be a large variety of diploma courses after the Matriculation examination, so that a majority of students are absorbed in specialised jobs without having to knock at the doors of colleges and universities for admission which, in effect, means only postponing the end day. It is also desirable to teach every student the basic principles of different creeds in order to enable them to imbibe religious tolerance and cultivate ethical and moral values in life.

The younger generation must also be very clear about the desirability of avoiding violence at all costs for achieving their objectives. In this connection, I cannot do better than quote from Arnold Toynbee's *Surrounding the Future*: 'Try, I would say above all, to remain compassionate-minded and generous-minded, try to remain capable of entering into other people's states of mind and of sympathising with them even when you strongly disagree with them. Try to put yourselves in the other people's place and to see why they hold these opinions or do these things with which you so strongly disagree. Go on opposing the conservative-minded members of your parent's generation. Certainly try to resist them and to defeat them in as far as their ideas and ideals seem to you to be mistaken, but do this in the Gandhian spirit, do it without hatred.'

Toynbee adds: 'Above all, try to be patient and avoid violence. Take your lessons from the leaders of the great philosophies and religions. Try to copy the gentleness, the patience, the long-suffering of the Buddha and Jesus and of other great souls, such as Gandhi, who have appeared among us in our own time.'

Radhakrishna

The problems India has faced during her 25 years of its independence—years also spanning the departure of Gandhi from the scene—can be isolated and identified. To me, however, whether they are economic problems (like increasing unemployment, a stagnating GNP), social problems (like non-involvement of people in working out their own welfare development), educational problems (like youth unrest, an inadequate educational system), ethical problems (like declining standards of moral conduct, the divergence between practice and precept), or cultural problems (like alienation of sections of society from one another, the generation gap), they all represent but diverse faces of a single problem, namely, our inability to choose the right model for socio-economic development at this turning point of our history.

Gandhi had fancied that freedom would usher in a new society, a counter-society, which would be closely related to his philosophy of life. He did not, of course, produce a blueprint of that society. But he perceived its contours as combining the progressive and dynamic forces

which the true Indian genius is capable of throwing up. A vast number of details in this concept has no doubt yet to be filled in. But inherent in it was the seed of a new society. Whether it was the Constructive Program, the transformation of the Congress into a Lok Svak Sangh, or the weapon of satyagraha, it was all a means to bring about and sustain this new society.

As a matter of fact, our failure to take the right decision at a crucial point in our history has not only affected our own country but the entire Third World. 'The Third World is becoming a breeding ground for the theorists of "identity crisis" and "the revolution of rising expectations" and provides the basis for a growing militarisation of the world, large-scale economic exploitation and widening internal disparities as a price for getting a pat on the back as "models" of successful economic development. The political consciousness of this was a continuing sport in which coups and counter-coups were watched with gusto by a "concerned" world press'.¹

We have fashioned our political and economic development strategy strictly on western models, neglecting the value system that could have helped us to make the critical choice. The choice that was made in 1946-47 can be seen in the context of what has happened in the Third World so that even yet we may wake up to a different perspective and a dynamic direction. The question, largely, is: Do we have the perception?

At the time of independence, it appears as though a concerted attempt was made to separate the advanced element of the Indian national movement from its more indigenous backbone. A careful study of the documents available on British policy in the period 1942-47 indicates that a crucial element in it was the highlighting of conflicts in the independence movement itself.² It should be obvious to anybody that the task the rulers set for themselves was to concede independence, realising its inevitability, to those who were nearest to their own ideas and outlook. Gandhi and those who thought like him had thus to be removed from positions of influence and authority through whatever means available. In this task the British seem to have had the full support of the Americans, whose aim, according to Roosevelt, was that they 'should try to think of some arrangement by which India found its place in the European and American, i.e. Western, orbit rather than the Asiatic'. The administrative, judicial and educational system which has continued in last 25 years is only a perpetuation of the very system which the rulers employed to subjugate India. In a remarkably frank

1. Rajni Kothari, 'Reflections on Building a New State in the 70s', paper presented at Seminar on Bangla Desh, January 1972.

2. *India, The Struggle of Power*, Vols. 1, 2 and 3 (HMCO Publications).

statement, Atlix is reported to have said, 'It is one of the great achievements of our rule in India that, even if they did not entirely carry them out, educated Indians do accept British principles of justice and liberty. We are condemned by Indians not by the Indian ethical conceptions but by our own, which we have taught them to accept.' Even the Constitution of India had to draw heavily upon and become a mix. of the British and American structures. The neglect of independent thinking at that point of history was too costly a matter to be ignored.

In spite of what Gandhi and other social reformers did in the beginning of this century, our own knowledge of ourselves has been very poor. In his introduction to the book, *Civil Disobedience and Indian Freedom*, Jayaprakash Narayan says 'After the first few years of euphoria since independence, a period set in of self-degradation in which educated Indians, particularly those educated in the West, took the lead. Whether in the name of modernisation, science or ideology they ran down most, if not all things Indian.' Not merely in the field of state-own, politics or administration, but even in the field of science and technology what is happening is merely a transplanting of what was developed during that period in the European world.¹ Such transplanting has taken place not only at the level of theories, but even more so as regards the organisation of technology and the direction of research. It is perhaps an exaggeration to add that science and technology in India, as far as it concerns our ordinary life, is only a little less barren than our state system and politics.

This is the crux of the nation's dilemma, and from this point of view the gandhian challenge is essentially an eye-opener. It questions both the assumptions we make in working out a blueprint of society and the means and method we use for its achievement. If we are not to go through the same vicious circle, ignoring the experience of others, our choices are limited. We are not completely lost; it is still open to us to see if the direction, policy, priorities and programs of this country—whether in economic development, education, social structures or political policy—could be entirely in a way different from what we have followed so far. Events not only in India but all over our neighbouring countries call for a social cybernetic model of development different from the prevalent linear model. The choice is between an economy which would sow the seeds of war and internal disunity, leading to centralisation of political and economic power, on the one hand, and the gandhian plan of antipodays on the other. The cracks, stresses and strains that are appearing in our body politic and social should be

1. Dharampal, *Indian Science and Technology in the Eighteenth Century* (New Delhi, 1972).

sufficient to indicate to us the dangers lying ahead. Gandhi's ideas, approaches and methods appear at this stage much more relevant to the problems we are facing. The critical years ahead command us to make a wise and careful choice. Do we have the wisdom to make it? That is the crucial question.

M. Rurhasswamy

Earlier this century a woman novelist with the pseudonym John Oliver Hobbes wrote a novel, which had some vogue, called *The Dream and the Barrenness*—a story of a period's hopes and ambitions and the failure to realise them in actual life. It is of Gandhi's great dream for India and of the failure of Governments and the people of free and independent India to realise it that I wish to speak. One of the great political visions that Gandhi in his writings and speeches rendered to India, and which I pinpointed nearly 50 years ago in my first essay in political criticism entitled 'The Political Philosophy of Mr Gandhi', was to bring into prominence the place of the village in the social, economic and political structure of India and the clamant need for improving the conditions of the villagers and the people that lived in them, the vast majority of the people of India. He was the apostle of rural reconstruction. In more than four decades of *Harjan* and *Young India* he preached this gospel of rural reconstruction.

Writing in *Harjan* of 29 August 1936 he says that 'if the village perishes India will also perish'. And he looked to the revival of the village, its prosperity and its self-government for the political regeneration of India. He pointed out ways of improving the conditions of the people of the villages through rehabilitation of agriculture and breeding of cattle and the improvement of village industries to promote the economic prosperity of the country. As for village industries, writing in *Constructive Program*, he said that 'village recovery cannot be complete without the continuance of the old village industries like hand-spinning of gown, paper-making, soap-making and such old crafts'. He had no objection to the modernisation of village industries. Writing in *Harjan* of 29 March 1936 he said that 'provided the character of village industries is maintained, there will be no objection to the villagers using even modern machines and tools that they can make and afford to use'. His ideal village entity, according to an article in the *Harjan* of 26 July 1942 was 'a complete republic independent of its neighbours for its own vital wants and interdependent for many articles'. Not only improvements in agriculture and cattle breeding and improved village industries, but he would also provide amenities like village wells for supply of clean drinking water, village schools, village playgrounds, village libraries. And, of course, he would remove the old patriarchal system of self-

government. In fact, it was through the village and through the villagers, those who lived there, that he would plan the resurrection of India.

What has happened to this dream of Mahatma Gandhi? It is a sorry business the story of rural reconstruction in free and independent India. The villages of India—the vast majority of them—are still in the miserable, unhealthy, poverty-stricken condition which he deplored and for which he castigated the British rulers. His writings, if only they are read and reflected, would castigate the present rulers of the country, many of them his disciples and followers. Nearly 400,000 out of the 535,000 villages of India are without safe drinking water, the women of these villages still have, to go a mile or two to fetch drinking water, not always drinkable, in pots on their heads. The same number of villages are without proper village roads that would connect them with the nearest market and thus serve to lift agriculture from the subsistence economy to the market economy which will bring prosperity to the farmers. 300 millions of the village population are still living in mud hovels, under-employed for want of developed village industries, even the cottage industry of spinning and weaving which Gandhi advocated sinking in the slough of despair. All the Five Year Plans that have been made by the Governments in India have done precious little for the improvement of the villages and for village reconstruction. Most of the money allotted to the construction of roads has been spent on privileged projects like the All India Highway from Kachnar or Dargajing to Kurnool, most of the money allotted for water supply, sanitation and drainage is spent on cities and towns, by far the much larger amounts of money allotted for industry are spent on large-scale industries. The literacy of the villages is half that of towns and the literacy of women is half that of men and literacy grows only at the rate of one per cent per year. Cities have prospered in buildings (mostly official and commercial palaces), in amenities, in educational facilities, in civilization and culture; while the villages, the vast majority of them, have stayed where they were in Gandhi's time. Cities have grown at the expense of the villages. Cities have grown richer and the villages have stayed poor. Cities are growing into the Great Wen in the body politic of India.

Is it going to be a vain cry from the dead—this appeal of Gandhi on behalf of the villages and the village people of India? It should not be if we are to judge from the patronage given by Governments in India to the republication and propagation of his writings. The volume of his writings on villages and village reconstruction should be the bible of every minister, of every legislator, of every newspaper, of every public man. It looked as if in the centenary year of his birth the wind was changing, for Governments in India as represented by Ministers, from the Prime Minister onwards, seem to have rediscovered the villages of India and the people that inhabit them. They seem to have turned their

thoughts and plans to rural reconstruction. They seem to have come to realise that the vast majority of the villagers of India are without the safe drinking water, the roads, the decent housing, the modernisation of village industries that would spell the prosperity of India. But the plans and programs of Governments are judged and voted by the sums of money allotted to each of them. Until and unless each of these plans and programs for rural reconstruction are put into figures they cannot impress. Until we find that at least Rs 250 crore are allotted in any future five year plan to each of these programs of village roads, village drinking water wells, village housing, village industry, we cannot believe in the genuineness and promises of these plans and programs. For instance, in the Fourth Five Year Plan the outlay on small-scale and village industries was to be Rs 250 crore as against an outlay of Rs 1337 crore on large-scale industries. Unless this ratio is radically changed in favour of the small and village industries, all the talk about the plans for fostering and promoting the village industries must be taken as 'words and fury signifying nothing'. One can only hope that the writings of Gandhi on village reconstruction will hit the conscience of our rulers and translate his Dream into Business.

Manubhai Shah

1973 is in many ways a crucial year opening up a new era in which India will have to decide her future course of history. The coming decade will also determine whether what Gandhi taught us during his momentous life has any vital insights to guide us on our future course. In my view, Gandhi will dominate our minds and our minds' eyes in the coming years more than ever before, for he was the greatest educator that India produced in recent times.

We are indeed passing through a watershed of our history. Old values are fast fading away but no new values appear to be taking their place. The old system seems to be out of date, but is it being replaced by a new system?

Three very vital issues are facing us today. First, there is too much fear in the air. Secondly, moral values, honesty and integrity seem to be of no consequence. Thirdly, our democratic structure is getting unhinged. These three issues need to be reconsidered and necessary correctness applied ere long.

Gandhi was not only khadi or prohibition or the spinning wheel; not only nonviolence or removal of untouchability or trusteeship; not only ayodyaya or the freedom of the bowmen of the bow or *daridranayana*. He was all these and much more—something lasting and permanent in terms of a value-based and system-based revolutionary reconstruction of our fragmented society. He had his practical, human-

capacity-based values and systems, with which alone a successful revolution can be carried out and accomplished in a deeply poverty-stricken society as ours. Our revolution is to build a strong, democratic, exploitation-free society. For this mighty task Gandhi as well as other stalwarts of our past and present are relevant. In this year 1973 we do need to clearly accept certain basic values and systems on which to build up our socialist democratic society, and in this gandhian insights are a most valuable guide for us.

First and foremost, Gandhi practiced as well as preached 'freedom from fear'. It is the duty of our national leaders at all levels, and more so at the highest level, to permit, encourage, respect and respond to the value of dissent. Without the freedom to dissent, no revolution can be applied successfully in a free democratic, socialist or egalitarian society. Even where the forces of reaction or extreme radicalism seem to gather momentum, an effort to take the cooperation of dissidents is a 'must' in the gandhian armoury and the gandhian ethos.

The second most vital value that Gandhi taught us is that even if we are not all saints, in order to re-establish a strong, healthy and united national character, the values of honesty, integrity and simplicity (not austerity) have got to be practiced at all levels of leadership. Pragmatism or exigencies of situation are being given undue importance. After all, whatever needs to be done within the processes of democratic functioning can be done with basic integrity and simplicity. Even though it is not at all possible for any or all of us to practice what Gandhi practiced and preached, it is imperative that in a country of our great historical and cultural past we must re-emphasize and implement the values of integrity and simplicity. These are not idle or ideal conditions meant only for saints (or hypocrites) or gods. I know many will try to mislead this. But I am certain that if these values are scoffed at, the nation and our leadership will have to pay a heavy price, heavier than what an eternal or gandhian value-based society would demand of us—namely, to adhere to and to practice the basic tenets of integrity and honesty and to live and work with simplicity and with a sense of equality and fearless comradeship.

Gandhi will be incomplete with only a value-based society if it is not married to a democratic and decentralized system. A value-based and system-based society alone can bring socialism and egalitarianism to a democratic nation. Even oral and autocratic people have been known to practice simplicity and integrity. There have been kings, dictators and emperors who led simple, honest and austere lives. But they left after them only a foundation-less, weak and crumbling society as soon as they disappeared from the scene. Therefore Gandhi insisted that the leadership at the top should promote, encourage and constantly help to nurture and build a multi-tiered functional leadership in order to delegate,

decentralise and develop power and authority at all levels.

If over-centralised power and authority were to replace decentralisation, a weak and divided nation will be the result. Gandhi never stood for or advocated a weak central national leadership. The withering away of the state of Gandhi's conception referred not to a state without leaders but to a state with leaders at all levels, self-reliant, respectful of lower levels and loyal to the higher skeleton of leadership. It is true that a strong and healthy country requires that vital residual powers and authority must remain vested at the highest level. In his time, Gandhi was the final head in all crises; and yet how often, almost to the point of self-humiliation, he yielded to the wishes of his followers. How many men and women he created as leaders at different levels of this vast humanity of ours. And in spite of frequent wranglings and disputes—which were no less in the years he lived with us than now—everyone often felt a sense of participation, involvement and belonging.

We have to practise, even if in an humble way, what Gandhi preached and practised all his life, by letting others at lower levels and still more lower levels act on their own initiative and motivation. That is why Gandhi advocated *panchayat raj*, *gram swaraj*, self-sufficient units and village democracy. This did not mean that he wanted a weak centre or a loosely fragmented country. A united country and strong central and state governments are not inconsistent with a decentralised, delegated, socialist democracy.

In the last twenty-five years, we have taken many steps in decentralisation. At the same time we have had to centralise and sometimes to over-centralise. Consequently the process of system-based democratic functioning has severely suffered. In all societies, situations arise and events take place which make all and particularly the leadership at top levels to feel that lower levels are most incompetent to take proper and correct decisions, and hence tendencies have developed at different periods in this quarter century of our freedom when the lower levels have been relaxed or deprived of their proper functions. It may be all right for a while, but in the long run Gandhi will prove right, as when he said that adult and universal franchise is better than a selective franchise. He himself toyed with the idea of a 'quality' and 'selective' franchise, but every time in the end he found, admitted and insisted on decentralisation as the manner arbiter of a stable and strong nation.

It is true that at lower levels, sometimes the decisions taken are wrong or factional or tend to weaken or make us loose in terms of progress. And yet, even though the process looks long and time-consuming, it is better to let lower levels use their initiative for the tasks entrusted to their care. They will make mistakes but they will learn their mistakes and rectify them. That is an inescapable process for their education and maturing.

'It is not a few excellent men who can govern well; it is the mediocre, the multitude, if trusted and allowed to function, that can give a strong, equality-based, socialist, democratic nation', Gandhi used to say often. He saw in the trust and faith in the common man the true foundations of an active and healthy democracy.

Therefore, in this year 1973, I would urge on all thinkers, leaders and persons in authority to analyse the steps that they take and the decisions they make and see whether: (1) we are building up men and women as leaders at different levels, (2) whether we allow and trust others, duly constituted, to function and to act in their respective spheres, (3) whether persons at different levels act on the basis of integrity and discipline, and (4) whether the end-products that we get create a social and political structure which will survive the long chain of history, where leaders come and go, but new leaders must be continually thrown up so that the future is held in the trust of men and women, one generation after another, who can keep the flag flying in glory.

This requires deep and frank heart searching. It will require cool introspection. Winning an argument or debating point will not help. We have to examine whether what we learnt and saw in the period of struggle under Gandhi has any meaning or validity in the present or not. There are good trends and bad trends in our situation. Gandhi reminds us that if, because of exigencies of situation, we miss the opportunity to insist on and practice values and to lay down a system, we will be missing his guidance to us. His path is not difficult to follow, for he never advocated an idealistic society or an idealistic approach. And 1973 beckons us to introspect and accept these basic fundamentals of Gandhi, his life, thought and work.

S. Shukla

To thoughtful and socially aware Indians, notwithstanding all that had happened in 1971, 1972 even when it arrived was not the year of exuberant confidence that daily and weekly journalism had proclaimed. Is 1973 the year of uncertainty, discomfort and restlessness bordering on desperation, even as glittering exhibitions in the Capital and 'socialist' pronouncements seek to reassure us? The aftermath of expensive military action, coinciding with the odd adverse year in the monsoon cycle, provides the backdrop against which to reflect on deeper and more pervasive trends on a national as well as global scale.

Our specific national troubles arise, of course, from the historical circumstances of having been a colony in the crucial period of the industrial and scientific revolutions. The consequences are many and profound. We converse in a tongue foreign to the overwhelming majority of our people. We thus disaffanchise them from the realm of

ideas, constructive as well as revolutionary, even as we train and disable ourselves in respect of the capacity to conceptualise the reality of our people and our existence in ways capable of transforming them both. A late arrival on the political and industrial map of the world, we not only suffer all the consequences of an adventive belatedness of trade—material, intellectual and those relating to power—but do so in an era when the resources of the globe are fast getting depleted, while the capacity of man to fashion social organisation and values commensurate with his increased 'command' over nature flounders, increasingly, a question mark. With a seventh of the world's population and with one-fifthth its land, our problems of both day-to-day survival and any move into a more meaningful technology and social organisation are of the utmost, rendered no less acute by the fact that we have an elite and an intelligentsia which is exposed to and has ambitions for the most 'advanced' standards of living in the world even to the point of ambivalence in its commitment to its nation and people.

None of this is, to be sure, the product of last year or the specific challenge of the coming one. But it is failing to recognise that only a quarter of a century ago, our choices were much more wide open. China's emergence after 1947 into rampant modernisation and nationhood and its consequent growth to world-power status—whatever we think of any aspect of its development—has constricted our choices further even as our problems have got aggravated. The direction of development envisaged by our elite is unmistakable. For itself, it is not prepared to settle for anything less than the 'best' in technology and life styles available elsewhere around the globe. The inequalities that that produces would not worry it, if it were not for the fact that the rest of the people also ask for a piece of the pie and are, in any case, not willing not to ask for the 'best' for themselves if they see it right within their own commitment. Hence the need for 'garibi hatao'. The cost of the 'haves' is much larger than it might otherwise be precisely because of the affluent ways of the elite. Meagre are the resources that remain for development, whether on the classical, hard, heavy industrialisation model, so attractive for its promise of national self-reliance and economic independence or even international economic and military-political muscle, or on the lines of the Mahatma-Hick-McNamara new economies so attractive to Gandhians or non-Gandhians (a la Iwanlich calling for deschooling as well as schooling society). The main hopes of the managers of the system, however illusory or frail, lie in directions international. Perhaps the multinational corporations will see India as the ideal investment arena, with its large and relatively cheap and ample supply of transportation, trained and inexpensive manpower and a moderately stable and sophisticated commercial-industrial environment. Possibly these, along with indigenous enterprise, will succeed

is 'transferring technology' and transferring back profits, to and from the more underdeveloped parts of the globe. All of this may create enough employment and prosperity in the country to expand as well as enrich the elite at the same time that the rest of the people are kept away from being unduly restless through immediate improvements in living, through hopes of a better future and through a certain medium of social mobility into the elite, so that the most talented and potentially politically difficult elements are continuously removed from their original places. Dissent will thus remain marginal and incoherent and become amenable to normal 'law and order', now made more 'efficient' by modern technology and communication. Ideology could be made more acceptable through consciousness media and some dissent could even be organised.

Past history may perhaps find little fault with this perspective. After all, most nations have been built on some such basis. There are only two difficulties. Is this perspective practicable? Does it not look much less appealing or moral today than it might have in an earlier century or epoch? Also, nowhere in history has an elite thought and conceived in language other than that of the people. Nowhere has its script been as undecipherable. Nowhere has it been as exclusive a club (two per cent of the population) for this reason. Effectively insulated from its native reservoir of ideas, practices and concepts through the difference of language, script and idiom, its escape from the world of work and people becomes more 'natural' and more easily possible. The English-(or even Sanskrit-) based pan-Indian unity of the intelligentsia is an effective barrier against its unity with its peoples. In this the Europeans have had a happier history. Having first united their nations speaking their common languages, they are now moving to an economic and political unity on the more substantial basis of popular participation and culture. For India such a prospect is open only separately—to the Nagas region extending from the north to the western coast, to the Bengali region and so on. To me, the language barrier, i.e. the English-non-English barrier, is at the present stage a crucial social-political barrier in our country. The displacement and detachment of English by the languages of the people remains a crucial step in the consolidation of the society in different regions. (This does not preclude the existence of more than one state in a language region.) All administrative, political, economic and educational measures that follow from the need to dissolve the English-non-English divide and to consolidate the position of the Indian languages are essential preliminaries to the building of a more viable and humane society. This appears more difficult in 1973 than it did in 1943. But only so if we ignore that the non-English-speaking are the deprived. The deprived are a native force in any society, given, of course, appropriate ideology and organisation. Are there any possibili-

tion in our country?

There do not appear any easy answers to the political-ideological questions asked. In any case, these answers are evolved by gifted and committed practitioners for serious and intellectual to write about, appraise, rationalise. Whatever be those answers, it seems clear that both in the process of achieving and consolidating desirable change, a new set of values and desires will have to be installed. A very pervasive process of political and social education for new values and new skills, without which man cannot live a humane life in as materially poor an environment as this country, is called for. An essential element of this education is capacity, skill and a positive attitude for the socially useful and productive work of the immediate, if 'primitive', environment—the exact opposite of what is produced both by today's organized formal education and by our political and social environment. Formal education cannot but follow the existing given structure of economic and political power. It can only socialize and prepare for the structures of incentives set up by the distribution of power and resources emerging from the capitalist-monopolist organization of industry and agriculture and, following it, of organized politics. But politics, which in the historical experience of India has been at the base of major changes like national independence, now requires to generate a new set of norms and values. For two decades, electoral politics helped to catalyze many changes, among them a much needed diversification of India's political structure. The past five years that have followed have demonstrated that this by itself is not enough. The tasks of restructuring economic power, of distributing decision making to all the people, of developing new values and skills through formal as well as widespread political and social education remain. And these tasks are now measurably more substantial, as noted earlier, than a quarter of a century ago.

One does not feel too cheerful raising questions in a pessimistic tone. Possibly the pessimism is explained by the fact that we are all a quarter of a century older than in 1947. But the fact remains that 1973 sees the facile optimism of 1947 or 1967 or even of late 1971 yield place to a mood of deep questioning, of a reserved quest. Does India have a place in the world? Can man live a human existence of dignity and of freedom from deprivation and oppression on this part of the globe? Can we do anything about man-made machines running horrors on brave people as in Vietnam? Can we limit the growing chasm between the upper tenth and the lower half of Indian society? To yield to a mood of despair would mean, indeed, a denial of even the possibility of a fully human existence. But to deny that there are no known answers or that the quest for answers looks difficult, in principle and in practice, would be possible only by denying even the nature and the magnitude of the problem.

K. Subrahmanyam

The year 1972 started for India in a mood of exuberant confidence and in the months slipped by a significant part of this confidence has evaporated. As we enter 1973 the country is bracing itself to face a period of food shortage. A considerable amount of heart searching is going on in the country in regard to our planning processes, methodology, priorities, etc.

The 25th anniversary of independence was celebrated in a sober mood. At the end of four development plans, it is now universally accepted that 40 per cent of our population live below the poverty line. The top 10 per cent get and consume nearly 30 per cent of the country's income. The amount of money the top five per cent channel from the tax authorities will more than cover the entire annual defence expenditure of the country. The foreign exchange lost because of smuggling indulged in for the benefit of the consumption-goods-hungry new rich is again more than what the country allocates for its security. The priorities of the national development plans have got distorted mostly for the benefit of this class. With tragic irony we may recall that the Mahalanobis Committee went into this problem as early as in 1951-52, at the end of the second plan, and in the last 10 years the problem has been further compounded. We are currently indulging in mock exercises, debating how far economic growth can be optimised with social justice, defence with economic development and democratic value system with social discipline.

There is a trend to coin new phrases and slogans, not because the old phrases and slogans have lost their significance but because we are really afraid to use those value-loaded terms in the current day context when the only value espoused by the parasitic elite is self-aggrandisement at the cost of the masses. The old slogan of *swadeshi* is as evocative as the new slogan of self-reliance, but the former carries with it the implication of the reduction of conspicuous consumption, boycott of foreign goods, rigorous resource mobilisation, etc. This cannot be adopted by an elite which does nothing about smuggling, of the order of Rs 200 crore a year, and trades mainly on black money, estimated at between Rs 1500 and Rs 2000 crore. Gandhi produced a atmosphere of social compulsion in which it became difficult for people to flaunt imported goods, and he deliberately made bonfire of foreign cloth and foreign goods against the protests of many respected leaders of traditional thought and values. Are we courageous enough to invoke the old slogan of *swadeshi* again in order to generate the same social compulsion on our elite?

Purna swamy also meant freedom from all kinds of pressures, including neo-colonialist ones. It carried the implication that the country's

security must be safeguarded and its continuous development ensured. It is a concept which will not tolerate a small fraction of the population compromising the country's development and security for its own class benefits.

Those who opposed Gandhi and Nehru, their *swadishi* ideology, their concept of *poorna swaraj* and their commitment to the Indian masses, have triumphed. The value system of the present elite is that of the maharajas, the zamindars, the British knight, the Ras Bahadurs and shikari contractors who got their children educated in Oxford and Cambridge and who dreamt of India continuing as the brightest jewel of the imperial crown. Japanese TV sets and American goods have replaced Lancashire cloth and British imported products in our elite's lives. The Harvard and Stanford business schools have replaced Oxford and Cambridge. The new neo-colonialist dependence has substituted the colonialist dependence.

Our planning process and our economic development philosophy have so far been geared merely to an effort to produce more goods and services without bothering to define the national value system which these processes must serve. The vague phraseology of 'socialist pattern' and 'mixed economy' enabled the state to enrich themselves, and the planners, the bureaucracy, the political parties—all part of the same elite—have avoided committing themselves to a national value system. Whether we adopt the western management philosophy or a socialist approach, it is necessary to start with the elite. What kind of society are we aiming to create? Our objectives must be derived from that goal and our plans formulated towards the fulfilment of those objectives. Without commitment to a basic ideal, the planning process has become sub-optimum and reaching of targets in various sectors an end in itself. It has been used by the elite to serve its own purpose. Investments were made, industries were established, incomes were generated and even a certain economic growth was achieved. But the benefits did not get distributed for lack of the basic commitment.

The crucial questions for India, not only for 1972 but for years to come, are whether this neo-colonialist, parasitic value system can be changed to a *swadishi* value system, whether the present elite will perceive its own interest in such a change of values or whether it will have to be put through the kind of cultural revolution which Gandhi attempted from 1920 onwards, and whether this can be done within the framework of our constitutional processes or a certain measure of extra-constitutionalism will be necessary.

C. Subramaniam

It is appropriate that *Gandhi Marg* should have organised a Symposium

on the 25th anniversary of Gandhi's martyrdom. A new generation comes up every 25 years. It is natural for the young men and women of today, who are the products of the post-gandhian era, to wonder whether Gandhi is still relevant for the problems of contemporary India. The answer, it seems to me, is a clear affirmative. As time goes by, we find ourselves constantly returning, with renewed admiration and gratitude, to Gandhi's analysis of our basic problems and what he taught us about where the solutions to them lay. During his long and active life, he was interested in almost all the crucial issues—political, economic and social—which confronted the country. Nothing that affected the welfare of the people was too small or unimportant for his personal concern. In the same issue of *Young India* or *Manjan* one would find articles by him on a complex negotiation with the British Government and on the nutritive value of the mango seed or on the proper use of organic manure as fertilizer. This width of approach was a reflection of his total involvement in all aspects of the life of the people.

The problems of poverty, unemployment and education were, however, the three major issues that were the continuous concerns of Gandhi. To my mind, these remain the three major problems that confront the country. They are not only the overriding issues to which our development effort has to address itself; they are also intimately inter-related. Poverty cannot be abolished unless there is productive employment. There cannot be sustained employment unless education is broad-based and functional. The educational system in turn has to take note of the economic conditions in which rural India lives and labours and cannot progress unless living standards are improved. Thus genuine progress can be achieved in tackling each of these problems only if all of them are attacked together.

The most important insight that Gandhi gave us in our political struggle was that means should conform to ends. To him it was meaningless to fight for the value of a free, open, just and nonviolent society through means which negated these values. In the sphere of economic development, the problem of ends and means takes the form of a search for achieving growth in a form and manner which simultaneously secures social justice. Growth per se will not be meaningful unless national wealth and national income are so distributed that every single person in the country—man, woman or child—has his or her needs for maximum consumption adequately fulfilled. The composition of GNP, the distribution of incomes and the pattern of development are as crucial as the level of aggregate growth which is needed for economic betterment. Since the structure of the production mechanism is meant to satisfy present and prospective consumer demands, the pattern of production cannot be changed unless the distribution of

income) and the consumption pattern are also altered. There can be a conformity between ends and means in the process of economic growth only if income and employment opportunities are consciously created in the hands of the poorest sections of the people so that they have the purchasing power to secure for themselves adequate food, clothing and shelter. These increased income and employment opportunities must also lead to productive investment and to higher production so that the slice of the cake and the share in it for the poor keep growing in a self-sustaining manner.

This outline can be translated into certain specific objectives. At the earliest stage of life we should assure equality of opportunity to all by providing nutrition to pregnant mothers and to pre-school children so that right from birth all citizens are endowed with an adequate physical and mental development. At the next stage of life, education should be free and universal. The educational system should take into account economic conditions and should emphasize full enrolment of girls as well as boys. School nutrition can itself be a powerful instrument for averting wastage and stagnation. The school system should also be oriented around agricultural practices and local crafts and trades so that it becomes fully relevant to the social and economic life of the people. There should also be a massive program for increasing literacy among adults as this is an essential pre-condition for progress in many sectors such as better farming, industrialisation, family planning and so on. Education has to lead to employment. Employment opportunities will have to be provided on a massive scale in both rural and urban areas. India is well endowed with land and natural resources. There is much scope and potential for increasing the productivity of land and for harnessing our natural resources so that our vast human resources are also full utilised in promoting rapid and self-sustaining growth. Apart from wage labour, the opportunities for self-employment can also be vastly increased through land reforms and a credit system which reaches the smallest farmer and artisan. As Gandhi pointed out, "No man should have more land than he need for dignified sustenance" and as he said, "Who can dispute the fact that the grinding poverty of the farmer is due to their having no land to call their own?"

Gandhi also pointed out that 'Civilisation is the real cause of the wide contrasts met in the multiplexedness but in the dabbars and voluntary reduction of wants'. He went so far as to say that 'If I take anything that I do not need for my own immediate use and keep it, I theft it from somebody else'. In a country as large and backward as India, we have to promote this concept of austerity and abstinence at all levels if we are serious about providing minimum acceptable levels of consumption to the poorest. Sufficiency for all cannot be secured with surplus for some. Poverty cannot be abolished unless it is first

shared. This was Gandhi's concept of 'daridranatya' which, I would submit, is an insight of the greatest significance and relevance to us today.

WHO'S WHO

Shahk Mohamed Abdullah, Former Prime Minister of Jamaica & Kashmir.

Mulk Raj Anand, Editor, *Marg*, Bombay

A. Appadurai, Visiting Professor, School of International Studies, New Delhi

V. Balakrishnan, Editor, *Eastern Economist*, New Delhi.

Bhabhai M. Chiman, Member of Parliament.

Durga Das, author of *India—From Curzon to Nehru and After*

R. R. Dwyer, Chairman, Gandhi Peace Foundation.

Archbishop Angelo Fernandes, Archbishop of Delhi

Devendra Kumar Gupta, Secretary, Gandhi Smarak Nidhi,

Hansrajrao Mahade, former Chief Minister of Orissa.

K. R. Malkani, Editor, *Motherland*, New Delhi.

D. R. Mookherjee, author of *The Guilty Men of 1857*, etc.

Shrihan Narayan, Governor of Gujarat.

Radhakrishna, Secretary, Gandhi Peace Foundation.

M. Raghavswamy, Member of Parliament

Manabhai Shah, Member of Parliament.

S. Shukla, Professor of Education, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi.

K. Subrahmanyam, Director, Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis, New Delhi

G. Subramaniam, Minister for Industrial Development and Science and Technology, Government of India.

The military as a target of protest

HERBERT M. KRITZER

MOST OF THE LITERATURE ON CIVIL-MILITARY relations is concerned with the relationship of the military to the civilian political structure.¹ In effect, the study of civil-military relations has been confined almost solely to the interaction of two elites. There has been little study of the interaction of the military elite with the civilian mass. The assumption seems to be that all of the significant political interaction between the military elite and the civilian mass which does occur is indirect; that is, the civilian mass affects the military elite by going through the civilian elite (e.g., by electing men to office who are pledged to increase or decrease military spending) or vice versa (e.g., the military requests Congress to pass or enact a military conscription bill).

One can point to two major exceptions to this intermediary model. There have been studies of the attempt by the military to shape public opinion in order to accomplish its goals. One such attempt was the effort in the early 1950s to secure approval of a universal military training program. Assistant Secretary of War, Howard C. Peterson, acknowledged that government money was being used for propaganda 'to sell the program to the public with the hope that the public would sell it to Congress'.² Another area of analysis recently has been the impact of military spending on the civilian sector.³ The reader will note, however, that both of these topics deal with the influence of the military on the civilian mass. There have been no studies of civilian mass-military elite interaction when that interaction is initiated by the civilians. This paper will examine one such form of interaction: civilian protest with the military as a target.⁴

The phenomenon of civilian protest directed at the military has become more common in recent years (though hardly an everyday occurrence). The protests that come to mind most readily have been a result of the Vietnam War. One such demonstration was the seque of the

Pentagon in October 1967.⁴ The Pentagon had become the symbol of the warmakers and about 30,000 people came to Washington to 'vote from the warmakers'. The Vietnam War has also sparked numerous smaller demonstrations, such as blocking troop and supply trains in California, or protests at Armed Forces Day events. However, a number of protests occurred before the Vietnam War. In 1959 a group of pacifists staged a protest at a military base in Omaha, Nebraska.⁵ In 1959-61, another group of pacifists staged a twenty-one-month vigil at Fort Detrick, near Frederick, Maryland, to protest the chemical and biological warfare research which was being conducted there.⁶ It should be clear from the above few examples that the military may become a target of protest in two different ways. First, the military may be symbolic of a larger issue, such as the Vietnam War (the Pentagon protest). Secondly, the military may become a target of protest because of specific activities and policies, such as chemical-biological warfare policies (the Fort Detrick vigil). In the former case, the military itself is not capable of satisfying the protesters' demands, in the latter case, the military has more (though not necessarily the ultimate) authority over the subject of the protest.⁷

This paper will look at four separate protests where the military is the target: opposition to the stationing of Polaris submarines at Holy Loch in Scotland (1960-61), a two-day vigil at Fort Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone to protest the involvement of the American military in Latin America (1969), a campaign against chemical-biological warfare preparations (Project CBW) focussing on the Edgewood Arsenal near Baltimore, Maryland (1970), and protests to halt the use of the Puerto Rican island of Culebra as a training target by U.S. Navy warships (1970-71). While each of these protests occurred in a different place,⁸ in every case the target of the protest was part of American military establishment.

Since it is desirable to bring some theoretical perspective to bear on these cases, and since there is no kind of theoretical perspective on civilian non-military civil relations, various theories of protest will be used to provide insights into these phenomena. These insights, in turn, will provide some tentative generalizations regarding the military as a target of protest. Consequently, the body of this paper will consist of the following: (1) a discussion of four theories of protest; (2) a brief narrative or description of each of the four cases; (3) analysis of these cases in the light of the theories of protest; and (4) conclusions and generalizations.

Theories of protest

Theoretical notions of protest have come from two distinct quarters: social scientists who are divorced from involvement in protest and

tend to approach protest from within the traditional political and social framework, and social scientists who are themselves closely identified with the protest movement and bring a less traditional perspective to bear. The latter group is generally composed of pacifists who are committed to nonviolent protest; hence, they tend to equate protest with 'nonviolent action' or 'nonviolent direct action'. While they themselves have an ethical commitment to nonviolence as a doctrine, their theories can be used to view nonviolence as a protest technique.¹⁰ For this purpose, nonviolence is best described as 'the abstention from physical violence'. We will look first at two of the most traditional writers¹¹ and then two of the less traditional writers.

James Q. Wilson has suggested that protest be viewed as a problem of bargaining in which one party has nothing to use as an inducement in the traditional sense.¹² This definition of bargaining, and of protest, includes cases in which one side succeeds by simple persuasion or by compulsion (physical force or leaving the second party literally no other choice). In the normal bargaining process, inducements may be either positive ('if action in accordance with A's intention is made absolutely more attractive to B . . . and not because other possibilities have been made less desirable') or negative ('if action in accordance with A's intention although no more attractive absolutely than before the change was made, is nevertheless more attractive relative to other possibilities that now exist').

'Protest is distinguished from bargaining by the exclusive use of negative inducements (threats) that rely, for their effect, on sanctions which require your action or response.' In order for a protest to be successful two things are required. First, there must be a specific goal—a goal which is capable of being met. Secondly, there must be an identifiable group or agency or firm which is capable of granting the end sought; that is, there must be a specific target.¹³ Wilson identifies four forms of protest: (1) verbal, including denunciation, campaign of adverse publicity, etc.; (2) physical, including picketing, sit-ins, and, ultimately, violence; (3) economic, such as a boycott; and (4) political, voting reprisals.¹⁴

Michael Lipicky has greatly expanded upon Wilson's notion of protest.¹⁵ Protest is 'a mode of political action oriented towards objection to one or more policies or conditions, characterized by showmanship or display of an unconventional nature, and undertaken to obtain rewards from political or economic systems while working within the system'. Protest is seen as an attempt to get third parties to enter the bargaining situation, who in turn work directly with the target group on behalf of the protest group. The protest group reaches the third party through the mass media.¹⁶ Thus the protest leaders must appeal to four separate constituencies simultaneously: (1) The leaders must work with and hold

together members of the protest organization with whom they may or may not share common values. (2) They must articulate goals and choose strategies so as to maximize their public exposure through the communication media. (3) They must maximize the impact of third parties in the political conflict. (4) They must try to maximize chances of success among those capable of granting the goals (i.e., the target group).¹⁷ Lipky argues that the problems of 'balancing the conflicting maintenance needs of the four groups in the political process' results in an inherently unstable process.

Finally, Lipky notes that there are six tactics of response by the target group who (1) may dispense symbolic satisfactions, (2) may dispense material satisfactions, (3) may organize internally in order to blunt the impetus of protest efforts, (4) may appear to be constrained in their ability to grant protest goals, (5) may use their extensive resources to discredit protest leaders and organizations, and (6) may postpone action hoping for the protest to die out.¹⁸

Gene Sharp has done extensive work on descriptive theories of non-violent action. This has included definitions of terminology and various typologies of nonviolence.¹⁹ Of interest to us is an important distinction he draws when defining nonviolent action. Nonviolent action consists of two kinds of actions on the part of the actors: '(1) acts of omission—that is, they refuse to perform acts which they usually perform and are expected by custom to perform or are required by law to perform; or (2) acts of commission—that is, they insist on performing acts which they usually do not perform, are not expected by custom to perform or are forbidden by law or regulation from performing, or (3) both'.²⁰

George Lakoff has identified three mechanisms through which non-violent action seeks to achieve its goal.²¹ Through coercion the protester seeks to take away from his opponent the ability to resist his demands. The use of coercion depends upon two factors: (1) the interdependence of the protester and the target and/or (2) availability of third parties upon whom the target is dependent and with whom the protester may form an alliance. An example of the first of these factors in action is the typical labour strike in which workers deny the employer the labour needed to produce the goods or services which constitute his product. If the employer has a substitute source of labour available, the strikers may have to turn to the second of the two factors above. One recent example is the farm workers led by Cesar Chavez, where the growers brought in non-union laborers to replace the striking union members. Chavez called for a nationwide boycott of table grapes (and subsequently of lettuce). In this way Chavez enlisted a part of the general public as a third party ally.²²

A second mechanism of nonviolent action is conversion. As a result

of the protester's actions, the target person or group comes round to a new point of view which embraces the code of the protester, that is, the target comes to see the protester as right and his own previous position as wrong. This is a process of attitude change, and all of the social-psychological theories about attitude change come to bear.¹³ The Wytham Temple Road satyagraha of 1974-75 is an example of the mechanism of conversion.¹⁴

The third, and final, mechanism identified by Luker is *persuasion*. The target person or group does not change his feelings about the issue at stake, and that need not be converted, but finds that the measures necessary to resist the demands of the protester are either more 'costly' than acceding to those demands, or that such measures are abhorrent because of the cruelty involved. The former often relies upon the immense value of the protest activity. The latter usually involves coming to see the protester in a new light because of his or her willingness to accept suffering rather than give up the struggle. The success of the women's suffrage movement is due in part to this form of persuasion.¹⁵

*Polaris*¹⁶

In early November 1960, the United States and Britain announced an agreement for the use of Holy Loch in the Firth of Clyde as a 'sheltered anchorage' for the United States' new Polaris missile submarines. This would involve the stationing of a submarine tender, the *Proton*, at Holy Loch and frequent visits by missile carrying submarines. Members of the *Proton*'s crew and some of their families would reside in Dundee and other communities near the base. This announcement brought an immediate cry of objection from a number of groups in Britain, including the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), which had been conducting an intensive, sustained series of protests with the goal of unilateral nuclear disarmament for Britain,¹⁷ the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War (DAC), and a number of socialist and leftist trade unions which were strong in Scotland.

Through the next several months numerous protest marches and rallies were held. In mid-December, 2700 persons attended a rally in Glasgow organized by the Glasgow District Trades Council. On 18 February, 3000 persons staged a sit-in at Whitehall; they handed a declaration of opposition to an official from the Ministry of Defence. Another protest was staged in Glasgow the following day. This one was led by piped bands and attracted a crowd variously estimated at from 4000 to 10,000 persons. The goal of these protests was to get the government to reverse itself and repudiate the agreement with the United States.

Throughout the time of these initial protests, planning was under way for direct action at the new base in Scotland. These protests would

have the military as a direct target. The military, particularly the United States Navy, was symbolic of the British government policies which the protesters objected to. On 22 February, DAC sent a telegram to President Kennedy warning that their supporters 'would occupy non-violently the submarines, the Proteus depot ship, and land installations. Our aim is to immobilize the base.' At the same time, DAC announced that there would be a march from London to Holy Loch between Easter and Whitson. The march would culminate in massive civil disobedience at the base at Holy Loch.¹⁰

At the same time, a group was preparing to protest the arrival of the Proteus in early March. On 2 March they had a rehearsal for their water-borne demonstration. The pacifist navy included five kayaks and two row boats. The protesters announced their plans as: 'We will cross the path of the Proteus and obstruct its entrance so that the authorities will have to remove us before they can bring the ship into the Loch. Specific acts of nonviolent civil disobedience to obstruct each of the submarines as they arrive will be carried out until May.'¹¹

That night a group of local youths entered the protesters' camp and cut loose the boats of the pacifist navy. By the time the Proteus arrived the next morning, the boats had been recovered, and the protesters went out to meet the Proteus. One of their boats capsized and the occupants were picked up by a British naval launch. Five protesters were arrested and several of their boats were confiscated. (About a week later, charges against the five were dropped and the confiscated boats returned).¹²

For the next two months there were only occasional incidents at the base. March 27, three men in canoes climbed on board the submarine Patrick Henry (which had arrived March 2). Local police were summoned and the boarders were arrested. April 22, two canoists boarded the Proteus, they too were arrested. May 1, the protesters' camp was damaged in a raid by a gang of local youths; tents were slashed and burned.

Meanwhile, the march organized by DAC was under way. The march itself was largely unsuccessful.¹³ About 35 persons made the 485 mile trek from London to Holy Loch. As they approached Dunoon in mid-May, preparations continued for massive civil disobedience when the marchers arrived on the week end of 30 May. The plans included efforts to board the Proteus and a sit-in to block the pier used by crewmen of the Proteus. The British Navy issued a warning to DAC not to attempt to board the Proteus: '(a) The planned demonstration albeit is a foolhardy and dangerous venture which might result in injury or loss of life. (b) It has been stated that the physical occupation of Amsterdam Pier, Cardwell Bay Pier, and Navy Buildings Jetty will be attempted. (c) You are hereby warned that all three piers are Admiralty property guarded by Admiralty constabulary to which access by unauthorized

persons is forbidden. Again this action can only be classified as irresponsible and potentially dangerous. (d) I am further directed to warn you that the authorities can accept no responsibility for injury to persons or damage to property which may occur if the planned action whose and effect takes place."¹¹

DAC requested permission for a deputation of members to come aboard the Proteus in order to explain the purpose of the protest to the captain. This request was denied.

The major confrontation came on 31 May. The protest navy included at least sixteen canoes, one sixty-foot launch, and a houseboat serving as a 'hospital' ship. Numerous efforts were made to board the Proteus. One man succeeded in climbing a greased anchor chain, he was arrested. Other persons who attempted to board were met with a high powered water hose, and were knocked into the water where they were picked up by police launches. Persons in pleasure craft who opposed the demonstration tried to harass the protesters by churning up heavy wakes and crossing the path of the protesters' boats. Nine canoists were eventually arrested and eight canoes were confiscated. About 70 persons had been involved in the attempts to board the Proteus.

Meanwhile, 200 other protesters attempted to disembark Ardsadam pier, the pier used by the crewmen of the Proteus. Police arrested 32 persons in an effort to clear a path on the pier.¹² This act was finally ended after 22 hours.

This protest was the climax of the Polaris action. The summer saw occasional incidents and the trials of those arrested in May. One final large demonstration occurred on 17 September. Three hundred and fifty-one persons were arrested in a strike at Ardsadam pier. Another 600 persons had been prevented from coming by bad weather.

The Polaris action was unsuccessful in preventing the stationing of missile submarines in Scotland, as was the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in general. This was not due to lack of media coverage. Rather, the *Economist* suggests, the protests, as they were reported in the media, may have alienated some groups who previously had tended to support the idea of unilateral disarmament (e.g., the Labour Party and trade union groups): "the ordinary trade unionist thinks that it is plain daft for anybody to express a political viewpoint by sitting down in the street".¹³ This alienation had been reflected earlier by several leaders of a protest march against the Holy Loch base by trade unions on 14 May. One leader was quoted as saying that the 'best help [DAC] could give them in Scotland was by going back to London'.¹⁴

Footnote¹⁵

On 19 and 20 March 1982, A Quaker Action Group (AQAG) staged a two-day vigil at Port Guelick in the Panama Canal Zone. A teach-out

was held simultaneously at the Inter-American Defense College located at Fort Leslie J. McNair in Washington, D.C., on 19 March. There were two purposes behind these actions. First, the action was to be the beginning of a long campaign to help educate the American people about the U.S. military and economic penetration of Latin America. Second, AQAG wanted to affirm support of those Latin Americans who were considering the possibilities of nonviolent action in their struggle for social justice. The protesters had no specific sets of demands, and the focus on the military was for symbolic reasons. The protest could just as easily have been directed at American oil or mining interests who are involved in the exploitation of Latin America.

It was for symbolic reasons that the Panama Canal Zone was selected for the site of the protest. The Canal Zone is the 'nerve centre' of the United States military forces in Latin America. At the Pacific end of the Zone is the headquarters for the U.S. Armed Forces Southern Command, which directs all U.S. military programs in Latin America. On the Atlantic side is Fort Sherman, site of the U.S. Army Jungle Warfare School. Nearby is Fort Gulick, home of the School of the Americas and the 1st Special Forces Contingent.⁴⁰

The vigil involved a team of 13 plus one photographer participant. Word of the impending protest preceded the arrival of the demonstrators. Two front-page newspaper articles had appeared in the local press. In the course of the vigil, the demonstrators met with both hostility and sympathy. The form of the protest was a silent vigil and leafleting; individuals left the vigil line to speak to passersby, argue with others who sought them out. The protesters carried four signs, one of which said, 'Quakers Say No Violence in Latin America'.

The vigil itself was quite uneventful. The vigilers were confronted with obscene gestures and sympathetic V-signs, heard things like 'eat shit' from middle-aged white women and 'peace, brother' from GIs, and were assaulted by the tropical sun and the insects. The only interesting occurrence was the arrival of a young soldier, out of the uniform on his day off. He had hitch-hiked over from another base in the Canal Zone, having read of the protest in the local newspaper. The vigilers immediately established rapport with him though he did not join the vigil line, he hoped to spend the rest of the day with the vigilers. The MPs, however, had different plans. The Young GI was detained for wearing improper attire (he was wearing forbidden blue jeans). After being held for an hour, he was driven back to his post for a reprimand.

The supporting action in Washington, D.C., drew over 100 people for the teach-out and a vigil. Normally, Fort McNair is an open base. However, the demonstrators were informed by the base commander that they would not be permitted on the base; they would be prevented from entering, by force if necessary. Since the organizers were more interested

in holding a march-out than in having a confrontation, they moved the site of the demonstration outside the gates of Fort McNair. After some difficulty, they were able to secure a permit from the Washington police to use a nearby park. (The permit was granted only after the organizers indicated that the march-out would be held, permit or no permit.) The march-out lasted from noon to 6:00 p.m. A number of speeches were made, and telegrams of support were received from two Congressmen; in addition, leaflets were distributed to many passersby.

Two members of the team that went to the Canal Zone prepared an evaluation of the project. They reached the following conclusions: (1) The vigil had had some impact in Panama through the coverage by the local press. However, it failed to have a wider impact because of the lack of coverage outside of Panama. (2) Many Panamanians expressed 'respect and appreciation for the action'. (3) There was little understanding of nonviolent action as a strategy for social change. And (4) 'the Fort Gulick demonstration should have continued beyond two days.

... The demonstration had only begun to stir public interest when it was ended. ... A continuation of the demonstration for several more days would have stirred greater interest and understanding among Panamanians and might well have brought a breakthrough in the news blackout over the rest of Latin America.¹⁴

Clearly, the action failed in its first goal, it did not succeed in launching a massive re-evaluation of the American role in Latin America. The action did not create enough publicity to launch that re-evaluation on its own nor had AQAG made plans to continue the project after the initial protest. The action was only slightly more successful in its second goal, since word of the protest did not spread throughout Latin America, support to indigenous activists could only have gone to those in Panama. One member of the project team did go on to a seminar on nonviolence in Mexico immediately after the protest; also, AQAG subsequently became involved in another protest action in Puerto Rico (described below) which, when combined with the Panama vigil, may have had at least some of the supportive effect.

Project CBW¹⁵

Project CBW was first suggested by one of the younger members of AQAG. He had attended a conference in Stockholm where he heard reports of the extensive use of chemicals in Vietnam. His initial suggestion was for a long-term project beginning with organizing of a general educational nature. The idea of a project focused on CBW was appealing to many members of the group. Some of the leaders of the 1959-61 vigil at Fort Detrick had been involved in organizing AQAG.

The goal of the project as it was finally conceived was to mobilize opinion in order to ban CBW, particularly emphasizing its use as

Vietnam. It was organized and carried out by AQAG, though it was nominally co-sponsored by number of other peace groups. The project was formally launched on 30 May 1970, and lasted until 3 October 1970, with the greatest activity from 1 July to 18 July and again from 29 September to 3 October. It involved a core group of 20 persons though as many as 150 were present for one-day periods.⁴⁰

Weekly actions were started in Washington on 30 May. These included street speaking, leafleting and guerrilla theatre.⁴¹ On 12 June the Pentagon was leafleted, and four persons were arrested for trying to distribute leaflets inside the building. During this period final plans and negotiations for the body of the project were completed. The project would consist of two phases. Phase I involved a march to Fort Detrick and Edgewood Arsenal. The specific goal of this phase was to plant three trees: one at the Ellipse in Washington, one on military property at Fort Detrick but outside the main gate, and one inside the main gate at Edgewood Arsenal. Civil disobedience was anticipated at Edgewood. This effort would provide publicity and a mobilization for Phase II, which would consist of massive demonstrations and educational efforts on a national basis hopefully resulting in a ban on CW activities in the United States.

The symbol of Phase I became the tree. The tree had come to symbolize many things including life, liberation and revolution. Activities revolved around the slogan, 'The tree is coming'.

The march began on 1 July with the planting of the tree, with permission of the National Park Service, at the Ellipse. The march itself was largely uneventful. The time was spent getting acquainted with one another, there was some interaction with non-marchers along the way, particularly with members of the churches where the marchers stayed along the route. There were occasional hecklers and some verbal abuse, but the incidents were minor. Along the way, subgroups made side trips to Grace and Company, a firm thought to have a CW contract, and to University of Maryland to talk to officials about CW research contracts held by the Department of Microbiology. The group passed for a sleep vigil at the Calonsville draft board where the Berrigans had led one of the first draft board raids. The one major event staged along the march route was a rally at Fort MeHenry in Baltimore which drew about 300 persons (the main attraction was Pete Seeger).

On 8 July in Baltimore the group split with 10 or 12 heading towards Fort Detrick and the rest continuing to Edgewood. The Fort Detrick group arrived on 9 July. The group had received permission to plant the tree outside of the main gate on base property. This was done to 'celebrate and encourage the intended change of Fort Detrick into a health research centre/which had been announced by President Nixon earlier'.⁴² After the tree planting, this group rejoined the main group at Edgewood

Armed.

The group arrived at Edgewood Arsenal around noon on Wednesday 8 July. They had been denied permission to plant the tree inside the base gate, though permission was granted to plant the tree on a grassy knoll outside the gate but on base property. This was rejected by the protesters. A 24-hour vigil was begun to give the base commander a chance to reconsider. A picnic and a meeting for worship were held on the knoll which had become the base of operations.

On Thursday civil disobedience began. The demonstrators expected to be charged with trespass, which involved a maximum sentence of six months and/or \$500. The group decided to attempt to enter the base in small groups (about four persons). The small number was decided on (1) to not be a threat to the MPs and allow for personal interaction with them, and (2) to stretch out the possibility of sustained civil disobedience with the hope of attracting others to join.¹² At 1 p.m. the first group attempted to enter the gates; they were pushed back and the gates were shut. The demonstrators sat down in front of the gates. They remained there for several hours. It eventually became clear that the gates would have to be opened in order for the employees to go home for the day. Around 4 the gates were reopened and the small group of demonstrators walked through. After a few feet they were apprehended by MPs; they all cooperated with arrest. The tree was confiscated.

Before the rush of cars began, a second group tried to enter with another tree and were also apprehended. The tree was left in the middle of the roadway. Eventually it was hit by a car and the pot was split open. After the cars had left, a third group tried to enter the base in order to retrieve and plant the second group's tree. They were apprehended before they could reach the tree.

Finally, a man in civilian clothes retrieved the tree and returned it to the demonstrators on the grassy knoll saying, 'you'd better plant it before it dries'.¹³ This was done and the group retired for the evening. That night the fourteen persons who had been arrested were arraigned. Five were released on bail or recognizance, the rest chose to remain in jail.

On Friday the protesters returned to the knoll area. After the first group of the day had attempted to enter the base (and had been duly arrested), the group on the knoll was ordered off base property (i.e., the knoll). After some discussion the group decided 'it was far more significant to be arrested while trying to plant the tree inside the arsenal than while defending territory, which after all [was] the army's game',¹⁴ and so moved back a few feet.

The next civil disobedience group was consciously an all women's group. This apparently caught the MPs off-guard since the women were able to get far enough to start digging (with teaspoons since shovels were

never taken inside the gates as they might have been threatening in the MP's before being apprehended. They were followed by a third group who were also arrested. All of the arrested, including the nine from the previous day still being held, were released.

The group decided not to attempt the tree planting on the week end. This would give both themselves and the base personnel a couple of days' rest.¹² On Monday only one group attempted to enter the base. They were detained and then released without an order to appear for trial. On Tuesday, a spokesman for the protesters was allowed to enter the base to attempt to negotiate with a base spokesman. The base spokesman refused to allow the demonstrators to enter to plant their tree, and reiterated the offer to allow them to plant the tree outside the base gate but on base property. This was rejected by the protesters. Another small group then attempted to enter the base without permission and were stopped, they too were detained a few hours and released without an order to appear for trial.

On Wednesday 13 July, a compromise agreement was reached. The deputy post commander agreed to accept a tree and plant it on the base as part of the post beautification program. The group of protesters would plant another tree on the grassy knoll.¹³ On Thursday the group of protesters staged a rally in downtown Baltimore featuring a mock trial of the tree. As the tree stood mute, paper-chained to a barstool, various arguments were presented in prosecution and defense. At the end, the judge left the decision to the individual commissioners of the hyattsville. After the rally, the group proceeded to the arsenal, and planted the tree on the knoll. Another tree was presented to a base official who accepted it saying, "I accept this tree as a tree to help beautify this post, not as a symbol of your movement".¹⁴

With the planting of the tree at Edgewood, Phase I of Project CBW came to an end. Work began immediately on Phase II. The first actual protest action of Phase II occurred at Fort Detrick on 29 September. A group had written to the base commander requesting to make an inspection tour of the base since it was supposedly in the process of eliminating its secret research. This was refused. Several groups of protesters attempted to enter the base anyhow. They were apprehended, given letters of detainment (formal notice that they were persona non grata), warned that they would be prosecuted if they returned, and thrown off the base.

The group then proceeded to Edgewood. They requested permission to enter the base to knoll and visit the tree. This was refused. These protesters entered anyhow and were apprehended. They were detained and then released.

On 30 September, the focus shifted to the Pentagon. The group had sought permission to plant a tree in Pentagon Park in the centre of

the Pentagon. This request was refused, but six other sites near the Mall entrance were approved. Nine persons attempted to go ahead with the tree planting in the Pentagon Park but were arrested before they could get there. (All were released that afternoon on bail.) Six or seven other members of the group went ahead and planted a tree in one of the approved areas. The next day two more groups tried unsuccessfully to reach Pentagon Park to plant a tree. (They, too, were released on bail that afternoon.) After the arrests, the rest of the group planted another legal tree. By Friday, the group had exhausted its supply of persons willing to commit civil disobedience; that day the remaining members of the group planted four more trees in designated areas. The demonstration ended that day after the protesters insulted employees as they left for the day.

During October and November, seven additional anti-CBW events took place across the country. These included a radio broadcast, teaching, and kneeling.¹⁰

What can one say about the success of Project CBW? In all but its most simple and immediate goals (planting trees), it was a failure. The overall goal of the project had been to mobilize public opinion against chemical-biological warfare. The project failed for two reasons. First, the project failed to produce any substantial nationwide publicity. The demonstrations at Edgewood produced substantial quantities of publicity in the Baltimore area but none of the national media picked it up. Only the first day of demonstrations at the Pentagon produced coverage by the national media. Second, AQAQ had done no planning as to how to capitalize on what publicity it did receive once the demonstrations had come to an end. As a result, the issue of chemical-biological warfare dropped from view as a public issue once the demonstrations were over.

Culebra¹¹

Culebra is a small island off Puerto Rico with less than 1000 residents. In 1901 and 1902 Presidential Executive Orders were signed that reserved all public lands on Culebra and adjacent cays for use of the U.S. Government under Navy jurisdiction. A later executive order had the result of requiring all private planes and ships to obtain special permission from the Navy in order to approach or leave the island (which is one of 76 municipalities of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico). The island is used by the Navy as a practice target for ship to shore gunnery training and strafing practice by Navy pilots. Since 1954 the Navy has wanted to buy the entire island, but this has been resisted by the residents.

In the spring of 1978, the issue came to a head. The Navy modified its proposal for land acquisition on the island. It offered to return 680 acres to civilian control, but requested a new assessment of 2330

sons of what then was private property used for grazing. At the same time the Navy was intensifying its shelling of the island. In fiscal year (FY) 1969, the Navy anticipated 5,000 bombardment sorties. This was expected to climb to 8,000 sorties in FY 1970. What this meant was that the island was being subjected to bombardment for an average of 9½ hours per day, Monday through Saturday, and 3½ hours on Sunday.

By mid-March feelings on the island were running quite high. A poll of 313 families showed 309 supporting a request by the mayor that the Navy leave the island. Following the poll, islanders marched to the local command post with an ultimatum to leave or face direct action. A few days earlier, a federal appeals court had upheld a lower court ruling affirming the Navy's right to use Culebra. On 26 March, the Puerto Rican Senate passed a unanimous resolution asking President Nixon to 're-examine the Navy's activities in Culebra for the purpose of assuring the residents . . . peace, order, free movement, and development of economic interests'.¹¹ These events resulted in a considerable amount of national publicity for the Culebrans' cause. Their plight was best summarized in a letter from a Navy official to a land developer interested in building vacation condominiums on Culebra: 'Culebra Island is a keystone in the Atlantic Fleet weapons range, which encompasses Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, nearby Vieques Island, and thousands of square miles of ocean area. This large complex is expanding and operations are becoming increasingly intensive, frequently being conducted through seven days of the week. As such our increases, takeaways of nearby areas such as your property will be subjected to the noise of supersonic booms, gunfire, rocketfire, and heavy air traffic.'¹²

What the letter fails to mention is that the entire island is a 'near-by area'. The main town of Dewey, where many residents of the island live, is within two miles of the target impact area.

Throughout the spring and summer a number of activities continued. Congressional hearings and investigations were made.¹³ The Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP) held a three-day encampment in the impact area.¹⁴ Starting as a small project, it grew to more than 600 participants. The Navy cancelled scheduled exercises only fifteen minutes before firing time. On 10 June, a group of twenty Culebrans stood in the target area and forced an Italian ship to cancel ship-to-ship gunnery practice.

Actions were not confined to the protesters. The Navy, at the urging of some Congressmen, tried to mollify the residents by offering 35 relatively high paying jobs. However, some of the jobs were snatched up by lower paid municipal employees who heard about them first and refused to take the higher paying jobs. This served to create more antagonism. Another incident, which did not occur until December, also served to heighten tensions. When the Navy started an underwater

demolition operation to clear an area of unexploded ammunition, Culebras 'plotted' the intended explosion point with three boats. After the commander ordered a team member to "pull the pin", two of the boats retreated but three women who had brought out of the boat refused to leave. The boat was hastily towed away just before the explosion.¹⁴

During the fall, an idea crystallized for a concerted protest action. Many years before, a Methodist chapel had existed on Flamingo Beach; it had been demolished when the beach became part of the Navy's training area. The plan was to build a non-denominational chapel in the target area in defiance of the Navy. The idea was developed by an informal local group, the Rescue Culebras Committee (RCC). Three other organizations came together to bring the plan to fruition: the Clergy Committee to Rescue Culebras, PIP, and AQAG. PIP saw the protest as part of its larger struggle to end U.S. dominance in Puerto Rico. AQAG saw its involvement as part of its opposition to U.S. military and economic involvement in Latin America, and thus as a complement to the action in Panama two years earlier; furthermore, AQAG saw itself providing the necessary link between Puerto Rico and the mainland. The plans were announced jointly in San Juan and New York on 4 January 1971. The chapel building would commence on 18 January, the date Operation Springboard, a massive training manoeuvre involving four NATO countries, four Latin American countries, 60,000 troops, 70 ships, and 180 planes, was to begin.

The Navy attempted to head off the demonstration by offering to sign a 'peace treaty' with the Culebrans.¹⁵ The Navy offered to phase out nearly all target areas, refrain from firing on weekends and Sundays 'except in most urgent operational commitments', and promised to search for 'feasible alternatives' for training operations. In return, the governor, mayor and others would 'use all regulatory and legal devices available to the Commonwealth and the Municipality of Culebras to assure that no dwellings or other habitable structures are constructed in the northwest safety zone for as long as the Navy uses the northwest peninsula for naval gunfire support training'. Furthermore, these same parties would 'use their best efforts, including moral suasion, to obtain the cooperation of everyone in keeping the land and sea safety zones for the remaining targets clear of people during scheduled training operations'.¹⁶

The treaty was presented at a hastily called meeting on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. If the Culebrans could not agree, the Navy would deny that the proposal existed. The proposal was read in English, and translated into Spanish. No copy was left on the island after the meeting for use by the islanders in discussing the proposal.

The mayor decided to go ahead and sign. However, there was a great deal of confusion over exactly what the provisions of the treaty

was. The mayor believed that it "guaranteed the return of all land used by the Navy on Culebra." The Navy had actually pledged only to look for other feasible sites, if none could be found, the Navy would stay. Despite this confusion, the signing ceremony, attended by dignitaries such as the Secretary of the Navy and the Governor of Puerto Rico, went ahead. The treaty was denounced by PIP and AQAG, and plans for the chapel building went ahead. Before the week's end, RCC also repudiated the treaty, complaining that the letter and spirit of the agreement were being broken.

Between the treaty signing and the day the chapel building was to commence, workers erected a cyclone fence blocking off part of Flamingo Beach where the chapel was to be built. According to the commander from Roosevelt Roads, this was "to prevent innocent people from going out there and getting blown up" and because "we [the Navy] knew this confrontation was going to come up and we definitely did want to keep him [Bernier, leader of PIP] out . . . we wanted to have a clear demarcation line."¹⁰ On 18 January the protesters marched the two miles from Dewey to the fence. There they were greeted by police who warned them that trespassers would be arrested. Six people decided to go ahead and enter, they went down to the water's edge and around the fence. When nothing happened to them, others in the group started carrying in the building materials. Some men tried to take away some two-by-fours and were engaged in a tug of war. The protesters emerged victorious and spent the next two days building the chapel.

Shelling was scheduled to start on Thursday 21 January. At 8:30 a.m., U.S. marshalls delivered a temporary restraining order directing the protesters not to interfere with the Navy and ordering them to leave the area. A dedicatory service for the chapel was held and all but six of the demonstrators, representative of the groups involved in the protest, left the restricted area. These six would commit civil disobedience. The marshalls returned several times to reiterate the court order, but the six remained. Finally that night, after the news reporters had left for the night, the six were arrested. They were flown to San Juan, arraigned and released. When they emerged from the court house, they were greeted by nearly a thousand demonstrators.

The shellings scheduled for Friday were cancelled while legal maneuvering continued, thus the protesters succeeded in blocking that week's shelling of Culebra. The following week saw numerous skirmishes and confrontations. The following, described by reporter Hal Wingold, was typical: "Four more demonstrators entered the target area, slipping around the Navy fence under cover of darkness, and again delayed the firing until being arrested and taken to San Juan like their predecessors. This time, however, even as the four were being driven out of the zone in a Navy truck under armed guard, three more protesters slipped by the

force (it extends into the bay but can be waded around) and took up their vigil in the target area.'

One youth, Luis Alonzo, 23, managed to get away from his Navy guards, moving further into the two-mile-long firing zone. Two Canadian destroyers, the HMCS Ottawa and Saint Laurent, were ordered to halt their shelling while Navy search parties sought Alonzo.

The delay lasted four hours. Finally, the ships started firing again, despite the fact that Alonzo was still in the target area. Twenty minutes after the resumption of shelling, the youth walked out of his own accord. 'I just got tired', he told this reporter. He said he had hidden in two different trees, and although helicopters and ground parties had passed right by him, he had not been spotted. 'That's why they're losing in Vietnam', he said.¹⁰

On the night of 29 January, the chapel mysteriously fell down. The Navy claimed it had blown down, but there was evidence that it had been pulled down. It was rebuilt by a group of Cubans.¹¹ On weekends Cubans came down to the beach to hold religious services, usually outside the fence but on at least one occasion in the chapel.

By 3 February, the Navy had had enough. The chapel was inspected by a 'structural engineering team' who declared it a safety hazard. The marines took the chapel down piece by piece and bulldozed the site. This incident touched off the only violence, on the part of the protesters, during the campaign. When the crowd tried to move in to save the chapel, marines responded with tear gas. Several molotov cocktails were thrown, and three marines were burned. Finally, Puerto Rican police arrived, as did the mayor, and the crowd was persuaded to disperse. Now only the fence remained. To it the Cubans fastened an improvised cross and a sign which read 'you took down a chapel but you can't destroy the spirit that builds it over again'.¹²

On 13 February, fourteen persons came to trial for contempt of court, i.e., refusing to leave the target area. Each was sentenced to three months in jail. After the trial, many demonstrations were held. A daily vigil at the prison where the protesters were held attracted as many as 4000 persons. The week after the trial more protesters interrupted Operation Springboard. In Washington, a support demonstration was held. A replica of the chapel, built as a protestor supporting demonstration at the Pentagon, was carried to some of the embassies of the nations participating in Operation Springboard. On 15 March, Cubans celebrated the first anniversary of their march to the local command post with their ultimatum to the Navy.

Finally on 30 March, the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Pentagon announced that the Navy would cease using live ammunition for its training maneuvers on Culebra as of 1 January 1973. Furthermore, the Navy promised to try to leave entirely by June 1973. This latter

provision was contingent upon several things, such as the Navy being able to find another area for its gunnery range, and a poll of Culbrenn to be taken later to determine whether they really want the Navy to leave.⁴¹

The Culbrenns appear to have won their demands; the protests were a success. This is the only one of the four protests which was clearly a success; how did it differ? First, and most important, the goal was concrete and specific. And second, the protesters used creative techniques and were able to attract a fair amount of national publicity.

Analysis

The first thing which these cases make clear is that protest with the military as a target must involve acts of commission rather than acts of omission. Since the normal contact between the military elite and the civilian man is minimal or non-existent, there is no opportunity for acts of omission—there is simply nothing to omit. This places the necessity for initiative with the protesters. They must invent something to do that will have an impact; that is, they must be creative. They can build a chapel, or try to plant a tree, or launch a pacifist navy. More common tactics, such as marches, vigils, or rallies will only attract attention to the cause if such actions attract massive numbers of persons. Thus a thirteen-person vigil in Panama attracts a lot of attention—vigils are an unusual event in Panama—but not even a notice in the United States where vigils are an everyday occurrence.

Success through coercion is very unlikely, even if the protest is non-violent. First, when it comes to ability to coerce, the military is king; violence is always at their disposal. However, in dealing with a non-violent protest, the use of physical violence is unnecessary. Through the disciplined, sustained response made possible by the military's structure as well as the material resources the military can mobilize, it is possible to outlast an attempt at nonviolent coercion. For example, even if protesters were able to block entrances to a military installation and deny access to supply vehicles, the military has the ability to build needed supplies. Second, if necessary, the military can pretend that the protest does not exist, and go on with its daily routine; that is, the military is relatively independent of the civilian world for its daily existence. The latter step is possible only if the military can effectively exclude the protesters from the area it seeks to utilize. Culbrenn would appear to involve one of the few instances where the military was unable, or unwilling, to deny access to the protesters.

The only way that coercion is likely to be effective is if it can be combined with a process of conversion, not conversion of the military elite—which I would consider virtually impossible—but rather conversion of the military man, i.e., the enlisted men with whom the protesters are

most likely to have direct contact. The enlisted men are the least committed to the military's goals and would be the most susceptible to conversion attempts. This conversion would involve bringing the enlisted men around to the viewpoint of the protesters in the hope that he will either defect or refuse to carry out orders directed against the protesters. However, for this to be successful, it must be done on a massive scale, and this is not likely to happen. Once the military elite becomes aware that such a process is occurring, it can respond by forbidding the enlisted men to have verbal contact with the protesters, or, better, frequently rotate the men so that there is insufficient time for the conversion process to take place. In some situations, it might be possible for the military to utilize men who do not speak the same language as the protesters, this would greatly hamper the conversion process (particularly if the military refrained from using violence which might gain sympathy for the protesters). Moreover, few protests have been launched which were sufficiently massive or sustained to have enough of this conversion effect to be significant.⁴³

Protests against the military are most likely to be successful if the demands are relatively small and do not involve issues of broad policy, and if the protests can be a nuisance to the military. This involves both Lakay's idea of persuasion and Wilson's idea of bargaining (though the two are not quite synonymous). In effect, if the costs to the military of the protests continuing are higher than the costs of acceding to the protesters' demands, the military will probably either give in or try to reach compromise. First, however, the military must be convinced that the protest will continue indefinitely; if the military believes they can easily win out the protesters, they will maintain their position. As Waldman points out in his analysis of Project CBW, one of the leaders of the project, known to the military, had previously led a twenty-one-month vigil at Fort Detrick, furthermore, the military did not know that the protesters had almost run out of persons willing to commit civil disobedience. Consequently, the military 'recognized the possibility that the project at Edgewood might result in a long action continuously taxing the base for many months'.⁴⁴

The success on Culebra is at least partially due to the same process. The interference at the firing range had created many problems for the Navy, guards had to be stationed there and numerous gunnery exercises had to be cancelled. The spirit of resistance on the island was rising. The Navy may have hoped that destroying the chapel would break that spirit, however, it served to increase the spirit of the islanders, the one group capable of sustaining the protest for many months. Furthermore, a sustained protest may have jeopardized the Navy's position in the case of Puerto Rico.⁴⁵

Once the military is persuaded that the protests are not likely to end

quickly, the bargaining process described by Wilson can begin; the protesters have a resource with which to bargain (i.e., discontinuing the protest). It is also interesting that in both cases where the protest met with a measure of success, the other elements Wilson argues as being necessary for success are present. In both Culebra and Project CBW there was a fairly specific goal, one that was easily met. Also, in both situations there was an identifiable person with the authority to grant the protesters' requests (the base commander in the case of Project CBW and the Secretary of the Navy in the Culebra action).

Lipsky's theory of protest is particularly important in understanding the success or failure of protest aimed at changing broad policies; these are likely to be the situations where the military is chosen as a target primarily for symbolic reasons. For such policies as American involvement in Latin America to be modified, massive mobilization of public opinion is necessary. Once this is accomplished, the public enters the bargaining process by threatening to withhold votes from leaders supporting the objectionable policy unless that policy is changed. None of the cases discussed in this paper involved in the massive opinion mobilization necessary for change. In fact, in the Feltus action the tactics used by the protesters may have mobilized a large segment of public opinion against the policy change they were advocating. This will be discussed more below.

Lipsky's theory is also applicable to the Culebra action. The media coverage received by the Culebrans did result in third parties entering the conflict on their behalf, primarily Congressmen. It is doubtful if the Culebrans would have been successful without Congressional support. Then again, it is doubtful if they would have been successful if the military had thought it could outlast the protests.

This suggests the limited applicability of Lipsky's theory to protests in which the military is the direct target. The military is relatively insulated from most third party groups who might enter the bargaining process on behalf of the protesters. The one major group which can effectively bargain with the military is Congress. All other groups (e.g., the public at large) would have to go through the Congress.¹¹ Obviously, the protesters could try to bring Congress into the bargaining process indirectly by first reaching a segment of the public willing to exert pressure on Congress. However, once this kind of process is involved, the protest process becomes much more difficult, and probably has a much lower chance of success. This is not to say that bargaining in protests with the military as a direct target is limited to Congress; however, the bargaining process involved is the one described by Wilson in which the protesters secure their own resource through the protest itself.

Finally, Lipsky's observation that the protest process is inherently unstable is clearly borne out in at least two of the cases described in this

paper. In the Polaris action, the problem of balancing constituencies resulted in the failure of the protest movement. The need to secure publicity required the protest leaders to find relatively dramatic tactics such as the pacifist navy and the sit-ins at Whitehall and Achnacarry Pier. This tactic, in turn, alienated many of the third party allies on whom the protesters relied for success, i.e. the trade unionists. Project CBW also met with many leadership problems though they have not been discussed in this paper. Problems of leadership style and the need for a decision making group caused tensions within the protest group. Many of the persons involved were committed to a non-elitist egalitarian form of decision making. The problem was especially acute in planning for Phase II. Because of this emphasis on non-elitism, all persons who were interested, a total of twelve, stayed on to work on planning for Phase II. The leaders of the protest knew that this was too large a group to work effectively, and before a month was out, the number had dwindled to two. The resulting demoralization was in part responsible for the ending of the project after the Pentagon protests in October.

Conclusions

When considering the military as a target of protest, one must be careful to distinguish whether the military is merely a symbol of some larger issue or if the military itself is capable of meeting the demands of the protesters. In the case of a larger issue, specific demands placed upon the military, such as accepting the test as Project CBW, can be viewed as a demand that the military is capable of meeting itself. Generally, however, the two types of protests with the military as a target have different means for planning, execution, and analysis.

When the military is primarily a symbol of the larger issues with which the protest is concerned, the protest differs in no appreciable way from any protest concerned with large, probably ideological, issues, e.g., CND. The best model for viewing this kind of protest is Lipset's in which the protesters seek to mobilize the general public, or a segment of the general public, as a third party by going through the mass media. In terms of their primary goals, both project CBW and the Panama action attempted to work through this kind of mechanism. As Lipset points out, this kind of protest is inherently unstable because of the conflicting demands and pressures of the various constituencies involved. Thus we see that the Polaris action was dramatically unsuccessful, and probably spelled the end of CND, because its leaders either failed to consider, or were unable to consider, the 'demands' of the trade unionists who were the campaign's major allies.

When the protesters have demands that can be met directly by the military, Wilson's theory of protest is probably more appropriate. The

military is largely insulated from potential third parties, and so the protesters must seek to bargain directly with the military. This is done by creating a 'nuisance' which is more 'costly' to the military than is according to the protesters' demands. In this way, Project CBW was able to get its tree planted at Edgewood.

A truly successful protest of the latter type can be viewed best by combining Lipsky's and Wilson's theories. This is the case with the Calabris action. The Calabrians were able through media coverage, particularly early on before the chapel was even thought of, to secure powerful allies in Congress, and in the Puerto Rican Senate. These Congressmen in turn, were able to bargain directly with the Navy; the support of the Puerto Rican Senate made it clear to the Navy that the Calabrian situation might bring their entire operation in Puerto Rico into question. The protest activities on the island, meanwhile, were making the Navy's continued use of the island extremely difficult. The Navy was forced to erect many churches and to station a number of men on the island for the sole purpose of keeping the target zone clear of civilians. Furthermore, the Navy was not successful in keeping the civilians out, and ran the risk of a major incident if someone were killed or injured on the beach during gunnery training. Thus the protesters had secured a resource which could be used for purposes of direct bargaining with the Navy.

(1) Work supported in part by National Institute of Mental Health Grant 5 RO1 MH17421-02 SR.

1. See for example S. S. Fains, *The Man in Herakleio: The Role of the Military in Politics* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1963); S. P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), and D. M. Held, 'A Topology of Military Organizations', *Public Policy Yearbook*, (1978) 3-48.

2. Quoted in Sidney Levy, *The Military-Industrial Complex* (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1976) 27. See also, J. W. Palfreight, *The Pentagon Propaganda Machine* (New York: Liveright, 1966), and Derek Sheuren, 'The Pentagon Propaganda Machine', in L. S. Rothberg and D. Shauer (eds.) *The Pentagon Machine* (Quincy: Dryden Press, 1970) 127-137, and Jerry Holushko and Gary Auld, 'An Alternative Answer to "Who Pays for Defense"', *61 American Political Science Review* (September 1971): 768-769.

3. See Bruce M. Russett, *White Paper: Exposed! The Burden of National Defense* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970) 127-137, and Jerry Holushko and Gary Auld, 'An Alternative Answer to "Who Pays for Defense"', *61 American Political Science Review* (September 1971): 768-769.

4. The one major exception to this has been the study of universal national defense. However, this topic deals with civilian non-military civic interaction in crisis situations such as invasion or coup d'état. For discussion of non-civic national defense, see Adam Roberts (ed.) *Civilian Resistance as a National Defense* (Belmont: Progress Books, 1972), or for a recent example, see Philip Woodrow and Adam Roberts, *Conscientiousness 1950: Reform, Repression and Resistance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

3. See the newspaper and magazine accounts reprinted in A.F. Sharp and H.M. Weinberg (eds.) *Nonviolent Direct Action* (Washington: Campus Books, 1964) 241-273, or Norman Mailer, *Armies of the Night* (New York: New American Library, 1969).
4. See William J. Young, *Mobile Witness: A Testimony for Racial Peace Action* (Penguin-Hol) Pamphlet 118, 1961) 3-17, and Neil Humeoff, *Peace Apathist: The Story of A.J. Moore* (New York: Macmillan, 1963) 3-4, 132-138; and 'The Call', 4 *Genethi Story* (April 1962) 177-189.
5. See Seymour Hersh, *Chimboel and Biological Warfare* (New York: Doubleday, 1969) 161-162, and 4 *Genethi Story* (April 1962) 173-175.
6. It is interesting to look at the protests against the Vietnam War for the symbolism of the target involved. The first few mass demonstrations occurred in New York. New York can be seen as a centre of public opinion generation and the first few demonstrations aimed primarily at mobilizing public opinion. The first major demonstration in Washington was the Pentagon demonstration; the war was the fault of the military and attention was to be focused on the evil-doers. The next two demonstrations, November 1964 and May 1965, were staged at the Washington Monument, the focus was the White House across the street. The demonstrators were demanding (in November) that President Nixon set a date for total U.S. withdrawal, and (in May) that President Nixon order the Cambodian invasion halted. By the time of the next major demonstration, April 1971, President Nixon had been given up as hopeless. The demonstration took place at the Capitol and the demand was for Congress to set a date for withdrawal.
7. One cannot say that they occurred in different 'quarters' since three of the four locations are part of or controlled by the United States.
8. See Theodor Ebert, 'Nonviolence: Doctrine or Technique?', 11 *Genethi Story* (July 1967) 231-260, and Herbert Krumer, 'Nonviolence: Definitions', (Harvard College Center for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution NVA Project, Report No. 15 February 1971).
9. Both of these writers were primarily concerned with civil rights protests, though there is no reason that their theories do not have a wider applicability.
10. James Q. Wilson, 'The Strategy of Protest: Problems of Negro Civil Action', 3 *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (1961) 281-303.
11. Ibid., 282.
12. Ibid., 284.
13. Michael Lapsky, 'Protest as a Political Resource', 61 *American Political Science Review* (December 1966) 1144-1158.
14. Ibid., 1147.
15. Ibid., 1144-1145.
16. Ibid., 1152-1156, it is not clear if Lapsky includes in category six simply quoting the protest; also, one can argue that there is another factor—to accept the protest leader's
17. Gene Sharp, 'The Meanings of Nonviolence: A Typology', 3 *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (March 1959) 41-64, in *A Dictionary of Nonviolent Action and Christian Defense* (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1970), *Exploring Nonviolent Alternatives* (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1970). Sharp has in press a book which will deal in part with the dynamics of nonviolent action, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: Porter Sargent). In this he discusses his notion of 'political protest' (the war discussed briefly in 'The Political Equivalents of War'—*Christian Defense*, 103 *International Communities* (November 1963)).
18. Sharp, 'The Meanings of Nonviolence', 44-45.
19. George R. Lakoff, 'The Sociological Mechanisms of Nonviolent Action', 3 *Peace Research Review* (December 1966) particularly 12-15.

22. For an earlier discussion of non-violent coercion, see Clarence Mordaunt, *Non-violent Coercion: A Study in Methods of Social Pressure* (New York: The Century Company, 1911).

23. For a discussion of the relationship of the literature on affluence change to non-violent action, see Sidney J. Pollan, David S. Olson and David L. Yaffe, 'The Effect of Nonviolent Action on Social Attitudes', in *Sociological Inquiry* (Winter 1964) 21-31.

24. See Joan V. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963) 44-52.

25. For a discussion related to this, see Richard Gregg's discussion of moral psychology in *The Power of Nonviolence* (Hemel Hempstead: Palladium Publications, 1959) 42-51.

26. This account is derived entirely from newspapers and periodicals, including the *London Times*, the [Manchester] *Guardian*, the *New York Times*, *Newswatch*, the *Evening Standard*, the *Illustrated London News*, and *Peace News*. For this, as for the other events studied, a search was made to discover what, if anything, the military was trying about the protests. The result of this search was pretty interesting. Nothing at all could be found about the Panama action or Project COW (nothing may have appeared in base newspapers but these were not available). *Armed Forces Journal* carried extensive coverage of the issues involved, largely devoid of the Navy's position. 'Our interests are with the United States Navy, but not about Cuba'. Not again. Our bases, our opinions have shifted from the Navy's side to the Cubans as we worked down and checked out the story on these pages.' (25 May 1970, 22). However *AFJ* did not even mention the protest activities. The *Polaris* action produced a small amount of coverage. *Starline* and *Rockets* mentioned the direct refusal protest when the issue first arose, and presented some of the objections and the Navy's response (14 November 1969, 12, and 11 November 1969, 11). The *Age of the Force Quarterly* carried an essay by Dr B. Hester (vol. 1, Winter 1969, 101-114) which discussed the mass protests over the *Polaris*. Hester defended the right of the protesters but questioned the 'reasoning' and success of the tactic of mass demonstrations.

The only article I found which dealt directly with official military policy regarding protests appeared in *Air Force Times* (12 October 1969). Base commanders were given advice about handling Vietnam protests, the emphasis was on base security, and local commanders were told to 'provide for increased armed forces police contingents at base entrance'. Other articles appeared which reflected military feelings (though not necessarily military policy) towards Vietnam protesters (cf. William Leavitt, 'The Vietnam-A Commentary', 48 *Air Force and Space Digest* (December 1969) 6-8). Generally, these articles defended in principle the right of protest and dissent but indicated contempt or pity (they 'are suspended' or 'detained') for those involved.

27. For a description of CHD, see Christopher Dennis, *The Dreamers* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964). The leadership of CHD included many prominent figures: the best known of whom was Bertrand Russell.

28. *London Times*, 22 February 1961, 15.

29. *London Times*, 3 March 1961, 3.

30. The *Evening Standard* reported that the Americans had mounted a 'quasi, white, and delusional public relations operation . . . Nothing that Mr. Emyr Hughes and his drenched Glamorgan marchers did or did not. Saturday has been quite as effective as the publicity stunts of the Protest crew men-in-arm with the battered, Clyde-belt motifs of Argentina.' 11 March 1961, 364.

31. In Edinburgh, fourteen marchers were arrested for failing to follow the approved route. They were freed and released.

32. *London Times*, 26 May 1961, 6.

33. These efforts to clear a path resulted in complaints of 'rudely rough handling'.

However, DAC announced a few days later that it did not intend to lodge formal complaints, stating 'the Committee fully recognizes that if direct action of this sort is entered into, the demonstrators are always liable to have violence used against them in the name of order'. *London Times*, 25 May 1961, 4.

34. *The Economist*, 27 May 1961, 874.

35. *The [Blackburn] Guardian*, 13 May 1961, 16.

36. Of the four cases examined, the least information was available for the protest in Panama and it came chiefly from the organization sponsoring the protest. Those sources are Charles C. Walker, 'Protest in Panama Canal Zone: A Background Statement', (Philadelphia: A Quaker Action Group, n.d.) and AQAG, *Evolution in Latin America* (Philadelphia: American Friends Service Committee, 1970) 44-54.

37. AQAG, *Evolution in Latin America*, 44.

38. *Ibid.*, 54.

39. Material for this section is drawn from two sources, Susan Richards, 'Project CBW: A Case Study of a Nonviolent Direct Action Campaign', (Haverford College Centre for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution, NYA Project, Report No. 31, June 1971), and Sidney I. Waldman, 'An Exchange Analysis of Project CBW: A Case Study of a Nonviolent Direct Action Campaign', (Haverford College Centre for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution, NYA Project, Report No. 34, August 1971). See also, Waldman's paper, 'An Exchange Theory of Politics', presented at meeting of American Political Science Association, New York City, September 1969.

40. See the 'call', 'A Call for Nonviolent Action Against Chemical-Biological Warfare', *A Quaker Action Group Newsletter* 34 (May 1969).

41. One guerrilla figure sketch used by the group in Philadelphia was described in a news release in the following way: 'An Vietnamese peasant gather in Rottenhouse Square to plant rice, they and their crops are sprayed with herbicides. The peasants accuse the poisoners chemicals while a group of Americans catches turn their backs to the dying people'. Richards, 'Project CBW', 4.

42. *Ibid.*, 16.

43. *Ibid.*, 20.

44. *Ibid.*, 23.

45. *Ibid.*, 24.

46. Some of those who had been arrested had heard Gb considering about having to work overtime. By taking the weekend off, the protestors could ease some of the discomfort which might have existed between them and have protested.

47. Reportedly, this compromise was pushed by a local newspaper who had been covering the protests and had access to senior base officials.

48. Richards, 'Project CBW', 31.

49. *A Quaker Action Group Newsletter* 35 (November 1970).

50. This account of events in Cuba is drawn primarily from Charles C. Walker, 'On Cuba: Nonviolent Action and the U.S. Navy', 13 *Good Will* (October 1971, 284-293), and a long series of articles in *Armed Forces Journal* (between 23 May 1970 and 19 April 1971). Other sources include the *New York Times*, the *San Juan Star*, *Lit* (10 April 1970), *Nation* (10 August 1970), and *Christian Century* (4 January, 17 and 24 February, and 3 March 1971).

51. Quoted in *Armed Forces Journal*, 23 May 1970, 39.

52. *Ibid.*

53. These hearings were covered extensively by *Armed Forces Journal*.

54. PIP, led by Eugene Dennis, is committed to a program of 'peaceful defiance' (nonviolent action).

55. Walker, 'On Cuba', 285, the page number referenced refers to a reprint and not to the original journal page.

36. It is interesting to note that the one military publication that covered the affair, *Armed Forces Journal*, reported the Congressional action and the peace treaty, but ignored the protest demonstrations completely.

37. Walker, 'On Colombia', 328.

38. Quoted in *ibid.*, 328.

39. *Philadelphia Thursday's Drummer*, 12 February 1971, 4. Quoted in Walker, 'On Colombia', 329.

40. By now an opposition group had appeared among the Colombians, 'calling itself, Sons of Colombia. They marched under the banner of an American flag, demanding that "insurgency" leave, and called for peace and inequality'. Walker, 'On Colombia', 321.

41. Quoted in *ibid.*, 321.

42. The 12 January 1971 *New York Times* ran a follow-up article on Colombia that was about nine months after the announcement of the Navy's plans to leave the island. The *Times* reported that the Navy had ceased using five summarizing and had sharply curtailed the extent of shelling on Colombia. At the same time, rock squatters from the main island of Puerto Rico had built a number of week end homes on unused Navy property. Charles Walker reports (in a personal communication), after a visit to Colombia in February 1971, that 'apparently the Pentagon is still hopeful of holding on to Colombia. There are reports that private Pentagonians fear that if "they get away with it there" others in Latin America may also try to oust the Navy or other aspects of American military power. . . . Secretary [of Defense] Laird announced that they would conduct a poll of Colombians later in 1971. . . . Apparently, the Navy hopes that the 64 jobs that they have created for Colombians (most paying as much as \$10,000 a year according to the *New York Times*) will have their impact and the people will vote their pocket books. There are those who say on Colombia that if they vote for the Navy and the Navy goes, that would not necessarily lose their jobs, because then the Navy would not need those jobs'.

There are additional indications that the Navy may not leave Colombia after all. Contrary to the Administration's pledge last year, the United States may continue to use and/or practice bombardments on and around Colombia, the tiny island off the coast of Puerto Rico. An internal White House memorandum from Mr. Gen. Alexander M. Haig, presidential assistant for external security affairs, has raised the question whether the island should not in fact be continued as a test to place for U.S. weapons.' *Fellowship*, November 1971, 38, 2.

43. The gandhian movement in India achieved some success with this kind of non-violent protest. Lately, the protest to leave the most success with this was the 1967 Pentagon protest, and it was not sustained.

44. Waldman, 'An Enthusiastic Analysis of Present CBN', 3.

45. A sustained protest might have launched protests throughout Latin America as AQAC had hoped the Panama action would.

46. In some political systems, there may be no group, comparable to the American Congress, which is capable of bargaining with the military, in other systems, such as Britain, only the party in power may have this ability. There is one way in which the public might be able to bargain directly with the military. This would be to deny the military a supply of willing soldiers. This can be complicated through conscription laws (though one can also refuse induction). Unfortunately, to be effective, this must be a very long term process and require substantial effort and resources, a group engaged in protest with the military as a direct target would probably be unable to do this.

The anatomy of Gandhi's satyagraha

RAM RATTAN

GANDHI IS ESSENTIALLY A PHILOSOPHER OF the politics of peaceful protest. He focuses attention on the narrower aspect of the individual's resistance to constituted authority and relates it not only to the wider context of his political life, but also to his nature as a moral being, striving to realize his divine self through the service of humanity. His basic dilemma is: how should a law-breaking citizen, or a group thereof, resist constituted authority, once he finds himself impelled to do so? He provides a definite guide to the means whereby conflict, especially political, can be resolved effectively and peacefully. And in his preoccupation with the means of conflict-resolution, he reverses Machiavelli's proposition that 'the end justifies the means'.¹ Gandhi's position is the means justify the end; noble ends demand noble means.²

Gandhi seeks an alternative to the way of violence (both in its organized and unorganized forms) which, he thinks, has failed, through the whole course of human history, to provide a lasting solution to human conflicts, political, social or economic.³ He is convinced that fighting violence with violence only aggravates violence, fighting evil with evil multiplies evil. Violence is to be fought with its opposite, non-violence, evil with good.⁴ The alternative that Gandhi offers says an emphatic 'No' to violence. His war is a 'war without violence', to use K. L. Shridharan's eloquent phrase.⁵

Gandhi's mode of conflict-resolution by peaceful means does not, however, imply passivity, weakness, helplessness or expediency.⁶ It stands for the greatest courage man is capable of. It is a weapon of the morally vigilant and the active.⁷ As Simone Porter-Brock puts it, Gandhi says 'No' to violence but 'Yes' to fighting.⁸ Gandhi's mode is characterized by force, action and effectiveness.

Meaning of satyagraha

The moral weapon to fight untruth with truth and violence with nonviolence is described by Gandhi as satyagraha. In *Indian Opinion*, he describes satyagraha as 'firmness in a good cause'.⁸ In *Young India*, he points out that satyagraha is just a new name for the law of self-suffering.⁹ And in *Lined Speech*, he proclaims that 'Sacrifice of self is infinitely superior to sacrifice of others' and that a self-sufferer does not make others suffer for his mistakes.¹⁰ Self-suffering brings the desired relief quickly and with greater certainty than does the imposition of suffering on the opponent.¹¹

When we put together Gandhi's statements on the varied dimensions of satyagraha, we find that he conceives it as essentially an attitude of mind and a way of life based on the firm desire for vindicating just causes, correcting wrongs and converting wrong-doers by voluntary self-suffering and by patient and active use of the means which are nonviolent and intrinsically just.¹² James Luther Adams elaborates the meaning of Gandhi's satyagraha by describing it as '(1) a nonviolent, (2) public violation, (3) of a specific law or of laws, or of a policy of government having the effect of law, (4) which expresses a sense of justice in a civil society of cooperation among equals, and (5) which is generally undertaken in the name of presumed higher authority than the law in question, (6) as a last resort, (7) for the purpose of changing a law and (8) with the intention of accepting the penalty which the law imposes'.¹³ Gandhi's satyagraha, thus, harmonises the cause, the end and the means.¹⁴

Joan V. Bondarant clearly distinguishes Gandhi's satyagraha from its obverse, dargraha.¹⁵ She discovers that, in contradistinction to the former, the latter means stubborn resistance of the opponent's policy or action, 'prejudged' to be ipso-facto wrong. The dargraha regards truth, justice, rightness as monopoly and does not allow the possibility of the opponent also being in the right.

In dargraha, the opponent is regarded as the embodiment of evil. He is, therefore, blackmailed, harassed and humiliated. He is not allowed to explain his standpoint. Even the distinction between the wrong and the wrong-doer is not maintained. The dargrahi first destroys his opponent's position in order to destroy his mankind. The latter is subjected to maximum suffering. As a matter of fact, there is no meeting ground between the dargrahi and his adversary. The former forces the latter to accept defeat and to grant the desired concessions. The satyagrahi, on the other hand, enables the alleged evil-doer to prove his point and allows a fair chance of its acceptance.

Purpose of satyagraha

The social and political wrongs for the correction of which Gandhi employed and evolved the method and technique of satyagraha, during his five-decade-long public career, is an illustration of the wide range of objectives which can be attained without necessarily having recourse to violence. Gandhi's satyagraha points to two related things. Negatively, it enjoins upon man the duty to eradicate evil and, positively, it reminds him of his obligation to serve the community.

In fact, satyagraha amounts to the assertion of a moral right which the state law should recognise but which it denies.¹⁷ It is to make up for the deficiencies of the law, and not for the defence of law itself, that a law-abiding citizen may resort to satyagraha. In other words, it is a way which the law-abiding citizens can adopt for seeking redress of their grievances and for solving conflicts and deadlocks on a durable basis.¹⁸ As such, satyagraha is a para-legal method of engineering peaceful protest against the laws, customs and practices which one finds contrary to the dictates of one's conscience.

In South Africa, Gandhi used satyagraha against the apartheid policy of the government.¹⁹ In India, he offered it for seeking redress of particular grievances, and for the wider purpose of attaining India's independence.²⁰ His recurrent satyagraha movements proved that satyagraha can be used for the vindication of a just, clear, unequivocal and impersonal public cause or issue.²¹ It can also be employed as an instrument of self-education and self-perfection.²² Commenting on the nature of Gandhi's satyagraha movements, Henry Prosch rightly points out that Gandhi's satyagraha was "an available and sometimes effective means for securing desired social changes".²³

Gandhi's satyagraha clearly distinguishes between the action and its author, the deed and the doer.²⁴ It shifts the emphasis from the doer to the deed so that both the satyagrahi and his opponent may address themselves to the solution of the problem rather than seek destruction of each other. Gandhi aims at the destruction of the evil act through the destruction of the evil-deed, but by changing his mentality so that he is enabled to appreciate righteousness. Like Tolstoy, he hates the sin but not the sinner. In *Harjila*, he observes: "The idea underlying satyagraha is to convert the wrong-doer, to awaken the sense of justice in him, to show him also that without the cooperation, direct or indirect, of the wronged, the wrong-doer cannot do the wrong intended by him."

In satyagraha, the opponent is not an enemy to be destroyed or defeated. He is a person who is to coexist with the satyagrahi. He is, therefore, to be helped to become a better man for himself and for society.²⁵ The satyagrahi is, therefore, obligated to enter into reason and

discussion with his opponent in order to awaken the sense of justice and fairness in him.¹¹ Should he fail in reason and discussion with his opponent, then he is to undergo self-suffering instead of inflicting suffering on the latter. The satyagrahi is to be ready to give up his life rather than take the opponent's life.¹² Voluntary self-suffering evokes the sense of justice in the wrong-doer by enabling him to reconsider his position vis-à-vis that of the satyagrahi. The satyagrahi's efforts ultimately lead to the discovery of an alternative which is acceptable to both him and his opponent. This is what Gandhi, probably, means by the phrase 'conversion of the wrong-doer'.¹³ Discovery of the mutually acceptable alternative helps the enemy to become other than an enemy — a friend. To quote Thomas Merton, satyagraha seeks to change 'relationships that are evil into others that are good, or at least less bad'.¹⁴

Satyagraha also invariably exerts purifying influence on those in whose behalf it is undertaken.¹⁵ It transforms the civil-resisters, emotions there. Gandhi's satyagraha movements proved that even the dumb and the illiterate participants become politically conscious and acquire a better sense of distinction between justice and injustice, right and wrong. Satyagraha and their followers find initiative and opportunity for participation in the social and political life of the nation. The South African satyagraha, for instance, enabled the so-called coolies and gave them self-confidence and self-reliance.¹⁶ On its conclusion, Gandhi himself was a transformed person. To quote G. Ramachandran¹⁷ 'Deep within him (Gandhi) were stored the first awareness of a great mission and we witness the rebirth of the man Gandhi into Gandhi the Mahatma. Mahatma literally means the great soul. That was an apt title which Dr Annie Besant and poet Rabindranath Tagore combined to confer on the transformed man from South Africa.' By precept and example, Gandhi proves that satyagraha can tear tyranny and injustice to pieces and yet 'redeem like the tyrant and his victim'.¹⁸

Satyagraha also quickens the conscience of the on-lookers and enables them to understand the respective positions of the conflicting parties. It helps them to take a decision based on the proper understanding of the merits and demerits of the claims of the conflicting parties. Proper understanding of the claims of conflicting parties by the on-lookers facilitates an early and intelligent resolution of the conflict. Satyagraha is thus a process of conflict-resolution by mutual understanding and by educating public opinion through reason, discussion and self-suffering.¹⁹ It aims at the cleansing of the whole atmosphere and voluntary change of heart and mentality of all the parties to a conflict. To use Richard Gregg's oft-repeated phrase, satyagraha provides to all the parties to a conflict (the satyagrahi, the opponent and the on-lookers) a 'mirror' in which every person sees himself as others see him.²⁰

Range of satyagraha

Gandhi's concept of satyagraha is comprehensive and universal. It can be employed by any man or woman who possesses the following qualifications or follows the leader who possesses them⁴⁷ (a) he must be an actual sufferer or a bona fide inviter of the actual sufferers; (b) he must be a man of truth and nonviolence; (c) he must be a shatagrahi—a man of steady wisdom; (d) he must be a law-abiding citizen; (e) he must be vigilant, disciplined and trained for the job; (f) he must be a habitual khadi-wearer and spinner; (g) he must possess virtues like compassion and civility (internal and external) and abjure lust, anger, greed, infatuation, pride, and falsehood; (h) he must strive through reason, discussion and self-suffering to arrive at a solution which is agreeable to all; (i) he must allow his cards to be examined and re-examined at all times and make reparations if any error is discovered; and (j) he must refrain from taking illegitimate advantage of the opponent's weak point, or any step not warranted by the principles and circumstances of satyagraha.

Gandhi desires every person adopting satyagraha, as a way of life or as a weapon for fighting injustice, to possess all these and similar qualifications. However, he does not debar others from participating, directly or indirectly, in various satyagraha activities so long as there is an expert to supervise and guide continuously and vigilantly their men of integrity, character and discipline. Comparing the satyagrahi with a surgeon and the satyagraha-participants with his assistants, he says⁴⁸ "Satyagraha is a purely spiritual weapon. It may be used . . . through men and women who do not understand it spiritually, provided the director knows that the weapon is spiritual. Everyone cannot use surgical instruments. Many use them, if there is an expert behind them directing their use. I claim to be a satyagraha expert in the making. I have need to be far more careful than the expert surgeon who is a complete master of his science. I am still a humble searcher."

Satyagraha can be practiced by a single individual or by a group. A minority can offer it against a majority and vice versa⁴⁹ Most of Gandhi's satyagraha movements were collective, except his Individual Satyagraha of 1948-49 and the fasts that he undertook as many as seventeen times. The actual instances of satyagraha offered by Gandhi indicate that he was modern enough to recognize the importance of numbers in a struggle like that of satyagraha. The number of people involved by him in India's struggle for freedom remains unprecedented.

Michael Walzer also subscribes to the same view. He points out that desobedience when it is not criminality, but morally, religiously, politically motivated, is almost always a collective act. It is justified by the values of the collectivity and the mutual engagement of its members. He is of the considered view that the right to disobey "is not a right often

claimed or acted upon by individuals throughout history; when men have disobeyed or rebelled they have done so, by and large, as members or representatives of groups, and they have claimed, not merely that they are free to disobey but that they are obliged to do so.³⁸

About the persons or agencies against whom satyagraha can be employed Gandhi has an open mind. He is of the view that satyagraha can be directed against any person or body of persons including the ones who are nearest and dearest to the prospective satyagrahi.³⁹ In the latter case, satyagraha is of greater advantage to the satyagrahi, as the adversary is likely to be more eager to arrive at an agreement than lose a relation, friend or neighbour.

Satyagraha can be practised not only against the government but also against society as a whole, as the latter may happen to be as wrong as the former.⁴⁰ Looking at the fairly long list of Gandhi's satyagraha adversaries, we find that as many as nineteen of his satyagraha movements were directed against various governmental agencies.⁴¹ The Champaran satyagraha was directed against the British indigo planters,⁴² whereas the opponents in the Ahmedabad satyagraha were the mill-owners with whom Gandhi had very friendly and cordial relations.⁴³ The object of his postcardal fasts were the wrong statutes of his satyagraha,⁴⁴ of his anti-violence fasts the anarchists,⁴⁵ and of his Hindu-Muslim unity fasts the communal fanatics.⁴⁶

There is, however, a serious exception to the rule that satyagraha can be offered against any person. On the basis of his satyagraha experiments he says that satyagraha can be offered only in respect of the person or agency whose cause and means appear to be prima facie wrong. He does not visualise the possibility of the opponent also being a satyagrahi, probably because he did not come across a satyagrahi amongst his opponents. Consequently he regards counter-satyagraha to be an impossibility.⁴⁷

Gandhi's satyagraha can be offered only on impersonal issues, for selfishness and satyagraha can never go together. He requires the satyagrahi to offer satyagraha in the spirit of promoting a common cause, without even being conscious of their selfish interests.⁴⁸

It can, moreover, be employed only in those situations in which the satyagrahi is required to act positively. Gandhi explains this point thus:⁴⁹ 'It must also be realised that there are evils to which satyagraha cannot be applied . . . For instance, if the government does not allow us to acquire land, satyagraha will be of no avail. If, however, it forbids us from walking along a certain footpath or asks us to shift to locations, or seeks to prevent us from carrying on trade, we can resort to satyagraha. That is, if we are required to do anything which violates our religion or insults our manhood, we can administer the inviolable physics of satyagraha.'

Simone Pater-Brick confirms that is Gandhi's satyagraha struggle, 'Action always followed the provocation of the government'.¹⁰ Gandhi's decision to undertake satyagraha was every time justified by the opponent's offensive. Thus, in South Africa, the justification of the fight in the Transvaal was the Black Act, that of the violation of the Natal Transvaal Frontier was the Immigrant's Act connected with the Black Act, that of endinging women was the Government's refusal to legitimate certain marriages; while that of the general strike was to keep the promise Gandhi had given to Gokhale to seek abolition of the £3 Tax on re-indentured labourers.¹¹

Satyagraha was conceived by Gandhi in an abnormal situation. It was born in South Africa in the context of extreme racism and was nurtured in India in that of alien rule. He employed it during his five-decade-long public life as an antithesis to racism, imperialism and various other forms of tyranny. He justified its validity under these abnormal situations on the ground that the democratic methods of agitation were not open to the people for fighting these instances of injustice. Racism and imperialism do not stand for truth and justice. Satyagraha is, therefore, a legitimate alternative for fighting injustice under these regimes.

Otherwise, democracy stands for truth and justice; it implies self-government and good government and ensures to the people the right to challenge and even change the government. Satyagraha too stands for truth and justice and enables the people to challenge and change any government which is inefficient, incompetent, tyrannical or unjust. The aims of democracy and satyagraha being the same, should the conscientious objectors be allowed to violate laws even under democracy? If so, how often? These questions have bothered, and even shocked, the conscience of the people in the post-Gandhi era.

In reply to such questions, it may be said that satyagraha is not conceived nor can it be used as an antithesis to democracy. Nor, again, can it be treated as a substitute for the institutional framework of democracy, since it is only a mode of fighting injustice and not a means of instituting a government. Even as it is, it relies more on individual leaders than on governmental institutions. And there too it imposes exceptional burdens on the satyagraha and demands unusual moral courage on his part. Gandhi's own record as a satyagrahi is deeply impressive. In fact, it seems that Gandhi's conception of an ideal satyagrahi is a description of himself. One such person was enough for involving the whole nation in its fight for freedom. But, in democracy, as Morris-Jones puts it, it may still be wise to expect less of individual leaders and rely more on the institutional framework.¹²

Thus, however, is not to deny satyagraha a place in parliamentary democracy whose laws do, ordinarily, enjoy the confidence and accep-

stance of the majority Parliamentary democracy, after all, is no perfect system of government. It has its own weaknesses and drawbacks. A constitutional objector may not always find the constitutional method of agitation sufficient. Satyagraha, in such a situation, should be resorted to only if and when constitutionalism finally fails the individual's aspirations. Except that it must be used sparingly and with utmost caution so that it does not result in violence or loss of people's respect for the duly constituted authority or its laws. This caution is essential despite the fact that the civil-disobedient's voluntary acceptance of punishment enhances, rather than erodes, people's respect for law. The very purpose of satyagraha is to substitute willing obedience for forced obedience and voluntary cooperation for involuntary cooperation. It is not aimed at replacing democracy with anarchy, although such would ultimately be the case if the former is not properly used. Thus as a supplement to constitutionalism and not as its antithesis or substitute, satyagraha has a definite place in democracy too.

Satyagraha preconditions

Satyagraha was conceived by Gandhi as an alternative to violence and cowardice and not to constitutionalism. A satyagrahi must, therefore, exhaust the constitutional means available to him before launching on direct satyagraha action. To exhaust constitutional means of redress, before causing an infringement of law, is a rule of prudence as well as of justice. It is a avowal of democracy. Through precept and example, Gandhi thus suggests that the following constitutional devices be exhausted before having recourse to satyagraha.

WAIT AND WATCH: Gandhi believes that 'patience and perseverance overcome mountains'.¹¹ His basic conviction is that everything comes right for those who wait, walk and pray.¹²

ASSEMBLING OF FACTS BY PUBLIC INQUIRY: A prudent satyagrahi must ascertain the full facts of a case before launching on direct action. He should examine, sift, collate and analyse the grievances of the group on whose behalf the satyagraha is to be offered. He should also take into account the merits and demerits of the opponent's case. It was for the correct ascertainment of the whole situation that Gandhi made use of this method on five of his collective satyagraha movements, namely, the Viramgam Question (1913), Champaran Satyagraha (1917), the Kheda Satyagraha (1917), the First Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement (1920), and the Rajkot Satyagraha (1933).¹³

TOUR (INCLUDING WALKING-TOUR OR PADAYATRA): Sometimes it may be necessary to tour the disturbed area in order quickly and effectively to check the spread of violence or communal animosity. A tour of the affected area enables the satyagrahi to establish mass contact and to educate or create public opinion in favour of peace and unity.

Gandhi frequently undertook tours for educating the masses about the evils of untouchability and communal frenzy.¹⁰

NEGOTIATIONS. No government serves without being asked, that is, governments do not undertake welfare measures of their own accord. People have to shout and strive in order to make their voices heard, to secure justice at the hands of an unimaginative, insensitive and unwilling administration. Gandhi was of the view that a constant reminder to the authorities is a pre-condition of securing the desired results. Those who feel aggrieved should appeal to the good sense of the opponent and simultaneously evoke public opinion in favour of justice and tranquility. He employed this method in all his collective satyagraha movements and in those of his individual satyagrahis which related to questions of nationwide importance.¹¹ He made numerous petitions to the government and led a number of deputations to seek removal of vexatious disabilities against Indians. Behind all this was his conviction that negotiations backed by the unreserved possibility or threat of satyagraha enable both parties to give serious thought to the problem, which is the first requisite of an honourable settlement.¹²

ARBITRATION. Gandhi admits that differences, we shall always have. It is human. What is important is that we must learn to settle them all, whether religious or other, by arbitration.¹³ It was during his Ahmedabad satyagraha of 1918 that Gandhi had recourse to this method.¹⁴

PROMOTION OF COMMUNAL UNITY. Having realised that under the British system of government one has to show some strength before expecting justice, he put a premium on the strength that comes from unity among the people. His belief in the effectiveness of communal unity is so intense that he puts Hindu-Muslim unity as a pre-condition for the attainment of *swaraj*.¹⁵

FORMATION OF POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS. Realising the necessity and importance of the people's united efforts for the redress of grievances, Gandhi not only established the Moral India Congress (1894), the South-African British Indian Committee (1896) and the Satyagraha Sabha (1919), but also actively participated in the activities of the Gujarat Sabha through which he conducted his Kheda Satyagraha (1918) and the Indian National Congress through which he conducted five of his mass satyagraha movements for securing India's freedom from alien British rule.¹⁶ Through the Satyagraha Sabha, he had raised a corps of satyagrahis with whose active assistance he conducted India's struggle for freedom.

PEOPLE'S MEETINGS AND PROGRAMMES. Gandhi is modern enough to recognise the importance of informing public opinion through the media of mass meetings and street processions. He thinks that an individual whose moral experience never reached beyond a monologue would know nothing at all about responsibility and would have none. Such a man

would have rights, including the right to rebel. His possession of the right to rebel would, however, be purely theoretical, he would never become a rebel. What is necessary is the clear understanding by the opponent of the essential points of the satyagrahi's cause and struggle. The better your opponent understands your condition and your cause the less likely is he to use violent means. The understanding of the merits and demerits of the claims of both the parties helps in the minimization of violence and the maximization of the possibility of an early solution agreeable to both the parties.⁴¹ With all this in view, Gandhi organized innumerable protest meetings and led many big and small street processions in the course of his satyagraha struggles both in South Africa and India.

Satyagraha preparations

On the conclusion of his Kheda Satyagraha (1918), Gandhi had realized that exhausting the available constitutional means is not enough for launching on direct satyagraha action. It is equally important to create a band of volunteers who would be permitted to offer satyagraha after they have undergone a sort of training in the use of non-violent methods. They are to be educated about the deeper implications of satyagraha.⁴² They are to be told about the attitude they should adopt towards the opposite party. They are to be told not only to abstain from the use of violence but also to stop the inadvertent occurrence of violence in any form and at any stage of satyagraha. All this necessitates a sort of regular education and training for all those persons who volunteer themselves for satyagraha. Gandhi thus recognizes the necessity of arranging training camps for the prospective satyagrahis. They are to be especially trained in the art of curbing levity, controlling large crowds and restoring order.⁴³ It was with the active assistance of such trained and experienced volunteers that direct action was launched during the Salt Satyagraha of 1930.⁴⁴

Gandhi also gives the satyagraha-pledge a definite place in his satyagraha primaries. He is of the view that the solemn declaration by the satyagrahis that they would peacefully resist injustice and cheerfully suffer the consequent hardships is enough to make the satyagraha action effective. He thinks that taking of vows is a sign of strength for it enables the satyagrahis to undergo greater suffering for the sake of the cause which they are pledged to secure.⁴⁵ It strengthens the satyagrahis' will-power and baffles them for the task they wish to embark on.⁴⁶ Gandhi's collective satyagraha movements always started with the participating volunteers solemnly and uniformly resolving (a) not to submit to injustice; (b) to refrain from violence to opponent's life, person and property; and (c) to cheerfully suffer the consequences.

Prayer to God for self-purification is also an integral part of Gandhi's

satyagraha preparedness. He believes that 'prayer from the heart can achieve what nothing else can in this world'.⁷¹ He claims that prayer to be his greatest and mightiest weapon. He maintains that it is through prayer to God that the conscience of the opponent can be stirred to make him see the rightness of the claims of those who strive suffering for conscience's sake.⁷² It was due to this inherent belief in the effectiveness and validity of prayer to God that Gandhi resorted to it before inaugurating his satyagraha movements, collective or individual.

The declaration and despatch of an ultimatum marks the dividing line between the constitutional and the satyagraha methods. The ultimatum is the satyagrahis' statement of minimum demands which the addressee is required to fulfil, within a specific time, and the non-fulfilment of which entails the threat of direct action. Gandhi had recourse to satyagraha only on the expiry, or the rejection, by his adversaries, of his ultimatums.⁷³

Satyagraha methods

Gandhi's main contribution to the theory of politics is his recommendation of a *modus operandi* for conscientious objections. In the course of his non-violent struggles in South Africa and India, he worked out a number of methods for seeking correction of wrongs and conversion of wrong-doers. The methods he recommends are not of universal application, for a set of them applies only to specific situations. Yet the following characteristics are common to these methods.

In the first place, the methods of satyagraha must be in full consonance with the ends to be achieved. An ardent opponent of Machiavellism, Gandhi propounds the theory that the means justify the end.⁷⁴ He is of the considered view that it is neither possible nor desirable to detach the end from the means employed for its attainment.⁷⁵ Neither can good come out of evil nor evil out of good. He likens the means to a seed and the end to a tree.⁷⁶ Hence his advice is that, while seeking correction of wrongs and conversion of wrong-doers, men should generally take care of the means and leave the end to God, with a fair chance of good resulting only in good.⁷⁷

Gandhi is also an uncompromising opponent of violent methods to serve the noblest causes, for he thinks that 'permanent good can never be the outcome of untruth and violence'.⁷⁸ He denounces the methods of violence as being barbarous and, hence, inconsistent with the genius of man.⁷⁹

Finally, he insists that the methods adopted for the correction of wrongs and conversion of wrong-doers must not merely be consistent and non-violent, these must also be in tune with time and circumstances.⁸⁰ He requires the satyagrahis to 'do as Romans do',⁸¹ without decoupling the essential unity between the cause, the end and

the means

During his long public career extending over a period of more than half a century, Gandhi employed and recommended the following methods for offering satyagraha:

BOYCOTT MEETINGS, DEMONSTRATIONS AND PROCESSIONS: Holding of banned meetings, demonstrations and processions occupies a definite place in Gandhi's main satyagraha movements. These are organized not only to register protest against the misdeeds of the government but also to educate public opinion against injustice. Gandhi employed this method to condemn the various forms of apartheid and alien rule.⁵¹ These were most prominent during Gandhi's Second Nonviolent Non-cooperation Movement (1931) and the Quit India Movement (1942).⁵²

CEREMONIAL MARCH: Undertaking a ceremonial march in defiance of prohibitory orders and thereby courting imprisonment is a very potent and drastic method of offering satyagraha. It also dramatizes the issue and attracts more and more people for resisting injustice and tyranny.⁵³ Gandhi adopted this method for the first time in the course of his South African satyagraha movement by leading a ceremonial march on 6 November 1913 from Chatsworth to Dander in Transvaal, without requiring permits.⁵⁴ The second occasion arose during the Salt Satyagraha of 1930, when he started his Dandi March from Sabarmati Ashram to Dandi on the sea coast on 12 March 1930.⁵⁵ During his Second Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement too Gandhi led a ceremonial march on 1 August 1933, from Sabarmati Ashram to Bas, in order to court imprisonment with the intention of 'sensitizing and commencing the Civil Disobedience Movement'.⁵⁶ He thus used this method mainly to evoke among the masses a sense of arrest, a sense of disorientation, against the alien British rule in India.

NATIONAL 'DAYS' AND 'WEEKS': Observing of National 'Days' and 'Weeks' is to record the nation's protest against the acts of terror, to seek redress of public grievances and to urge the government to fulfil its promises. These are also observed by the satyagrahis for their own purification and for the renewal of their satyagraha pledge. The underlying object is to reanimate the mass consciousness and to consolidate public cooperation. Some of these 'Days' were the Satyagraha Day (1931),⁵⁷ Khilafat Days (1919-1920),⁵⁸ Independence Day (1930),⁵⁹ Gandhi Day (1930), and the Flag Day, Motilal Day, Shotagar Day, Famine Day and Gorkhali Day during the Second Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement of 1931-1934.⁶⁰

PAMPHLETS AND NEWS-PAPERS: Publication of pamphlets and newspapers is another important method of seeking redress of grievances, defying unwarranted restrictions on the freedom of the press and challenging the government to support the civil resisters. This method is also employed for removing the causes of misunderstanding between

the rulers and the ruled, promoting communal amity, seeking the uplift of the backward classes, and mobilising public opinion to bring home the deeper implications of satyagraha. Gandhi's first pamphlet, popularly known as the 'Green Pamphlet' was entitled *The Grievances of The British Indians in South Africa—An Appeal to The Indian Public*.¹⁰ This was followed by his famous booklet, *Hind Swaraj*.¹¹ In India, he issued seventeen leaflets during his Ahmedabad Satyagraha, one pamphlet and a manifesto during his Kheda Satyagraha, twenty-one leaflets during his Rowlett Act Satyagraha, a daily News Bulletin and a number of pamphlets during the Bardoli Satyagraha and two issues of Satyagraha during his Rowlett Act Satyagraha.¹² In addition to these occasional leaflets, pamphlets, booklets and bulletins, he edited and sponsored three English weeklies, namely, *Indian Opinion* (1903-1914), *Young India* (1918-1931) and *Harijan* (1933-1948).¹³ He often brought out Hindi, Gujarati and Tamil editions of these week-papers.

HARTAL: Hartal means voluntary closure of shops and suspension of business, usually for a symbolic period of 24 hours.¹⁴ It is an outward expression of the community's disapproval of unwarranted laws and arbitrary orders. It is also employed to lodge the people's protest against the arrest of satyagrahis and to boycott the visits of government officials. It provides occasions both for offering public prayers and observing a state of mourning, if necessary.¹⁵ Gandhi applied this method for the first time during his South African satyagraha movement on 28 July 1907 as a demonstration of the extreme dissatisfaction of the Transvaal Indian businessmen with the Asiatic Registration Act.¹⁶ On subsequent occasions, it was employed as and when its need arose during his satyagraha struggles.

STRIKES: The strike is labour's instrument for the acquisition of a desired standard of treatment and living from the employer.¹⁷ It was specifically this object that prompted Gandhi during his Ahmedabad Satyagraha to administer to the millworkers an oath on 26 February 1918 not to resume work till their grievances were redressed.¹⁸

Strikes may also be employed directly and openly to achieve political ends, as for seeking repeal of the £ 3 Tax in South Africa.¹⁹ Gandhi is, however, against strikes in public-utility services like the railways, police, mail-services, post-offices, etc. A strike in such services puts the community, or at least a substantial section of it, to loss, harassment or inconvenience. Dislocation of these services endangers public life.²⁰

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: Civil disobedience can be undertaken for the deliberate breach of certain nonmoral statutory enactments, or as the symbolic nonviolent revolt against the State. In either case, it does not reflect want of respect for the constituted authority.²¹ Its ultimate aim is to substitute voluntary cooperation for involuntary cooperation and willing obedience for forced obedience. This underlying objective alone

can make the satyagrahis adhere to their inner voice.¹²⁸ Thus conceived, civil disobedience was offered by Gandhi and his co-workers in South Africa by refusing to submit to compulsory re-registrations, by boycotting and picketing the government offices, by refusing to give finger prints or thumb impressions, by travelling without licences or by declining to produce them when demanded, by trading without licences and by crossing into neighbouring provinces without registration certificates.¹²⁹ In India civil disobedience was offered by him and his co-satyagrahis by violating laws regarding publication of prohibited literature, by desalting salt from sea-water, by violating unjust codes of all sorts, and by cutting palm trees which were a source of revenue to the government.¹³⁰

NONVIOLENT NON-COOPERATION The technique of nonviolent non-cooperation is an alternative to anarchy. It is conceived by Gandhi as a positive force as much as it means cooperation with all that is good.¹³¹ Thus conceived, this method was used by him during his five mass satyagraha movements for securing India's independence from British rule.

Gandhi's nonviolent non-cooperation with the alien British Government was a total non-cooperation. The use of this method in respect of a democratic government would necessarily be limited, for self-government is essentially based on the principle of the consent of the majority. If a democratic government goes wrong, partial non-cooperation with it is permissible, as total non-cooperation would destroy the democratic institutions themselves. To quote Gandhi: 'Total nonviolent non-cooperation has, then, no place in popular Raj, whatever its level may be.'¹³²

NO-TAX CAMPAIGN. The satyagrahis may try to cut the very life-line of the Government by refusing to pay taxes. All functions of the Government would stop the moment people withhold payment of taxes.¹³³ The entire administration would come to a standstill for want of finances. This extreme method should, however, be resorted to only when no other way is left open and the only choice is between complete annihilation and total reformation. It should never be employed in haste or for evoking a ready response amongst the people. The call for its adoption should be given to them only after they have been convinced of its full implications. Because once the people stop paying taxes, the Government uses its force to recover the same. The defaulters may or may not be sued in court. In either case, they may be put behind bars and their property confiscated. A no-tax campaign should, therefore, be launched only if and when the people have been psychologically prepared to undergo the sufferings and sacrifices which their refusal to pay the taxes may involve.

Gandhi asked the people not to pay taxes to the Government in the course of his Kheda Satyagraha (1918)¹³⁴ and the Karnataka Satyagraha (1931).¹³⁵ In the course of the Bardoli Satyagraha (1928),¹³⁶ the

Salt Satyagraha (1930)¹⁰⁴ and the Second Nonviolent Non-cooperation Movement (1931)¹⁰⁵ also no-tax campaigns were launched. Finally, during the Individual Satyagraha (1940) Gandhi gave the call of '*na ak pat na ak bhaf*', as a protest against the British Government's action involving India in the Second World War without her consent.¹⁰⁶

COURTING IMPRISONMENT: Having imprisonment by the deliberate breach of laws contrary to one's conscience as an effective mode of registering protest with the adversary.¹⁰⁷ Governments often accede even to the genuine demands of the people only under pressure.¹⁰⁸ And the purpose of non-payment of taxes is to bring economic and political pressure to bear on the Government. When people suffer for conscience's sake, their voluntary suffering creates a public opinion unfavourable to the misdeeds of the oppressor and often forces his hands to grant justice.¹⁰⁹

The spectacle of numbers of people ready to suffer indignities, arrest, legal penalties and sometimes even physical injuries for the cause they have embarked upon also impresses the public in their favour. The public sees their dedication, their seriousness and the intensity of their devotion to the cause and is thus led to respect them. It counts on them and their wishes as the real power to be reckoned with. Accomplishing one's own arrest and punishment also keeps injury to the general public quite at a minimum. On the other hand, the non-use of violence by the satyagrahis against their adversary enables them to be true to their conscience, for they taste suffering without inflicting it upon the opponent.¹¹⁰

Courting imprisonment became a frequent occurrence during Gandhi's satyagraha movements. He not only advised his co-satyagrahis and others to adopt this method, he himself courted imprisonment four times during his South African satyagraha movement and six times in the course of his satyagraha campaigns in India, spending in various prisons a total period of 6 years, 4 months and 14 days.¹¹¹ As he admitted, he became almost a 'habitual prisoner'.¹¹² He said: 'I would far rather pass the whole of my lifetime in jail and be perfectly happy than see my fellow-countrymen subjected to indignity and I should come out of the jail.'¹¹³ Everytime Gandhi went to an Indian jail, he wished to be released by a 'Swaraj Parliament',¹¹⁴ but this was not his fate.

BOYCOTT: Boycott is a sort of punishment and is conceived in a vindictive spirit.¹¹⁵ The object of the boycott of commodities, titles, persons and institutions is not only to lodge protest against but also to put pressure on the opposite party in order ultimately to seek redress of grievances. The idea is to revenge oneself against the adversary for the wrongs done by him. It is employed to 'bring about a breakdown of law and order' and thus to tell the lawbreakers that the satyagrahis would

not be a party to wrong-doing.¹²⁷ It also puts economic pressure on the opponent in order to force him to grant justice expeditiously. Thus conceived, this method was employed and experimented by Gandhi in different situations both in South Africa and India.

In South Africa, the satyagraha campaign was characterised by the boycott of permit offices, registration certificates and the local *Boer* shops arranged to welcome the Duke of Cornwall and subsequently to celebrate the coronation of King George V.¹²⁸ In India, the satyagraha campaign envisaged the complete boycott of foreign goods, institutions, honours and official functions.¹²⁹ In the course of the Bardoli Satyagraha (1928) the revenue collectors were also socially boycotted.¹³⁰ All these multifarious instances of boycott reveal Gandhi's sincere attempt to seek redress of grievances by exercising allround pressure on the government and to create political awakening and the *swadeshi* spirit amongst the Indian masses.

PEACEFUL PICKETING: The purpose of peaceful picketing is also to put socio-political-economic pressure on the government and awaken courage to create political consciousness and the *swadeshi* spirit amongst the masses. The picket's attitude even towards the alleged wrong-doers or 'black-legs' is essentially non-violent. The picket is only to dissuade them from doing the intended wrong. He is not to coerce, insult or intimidate them. His only weapon is his speech which, too, is to be used gently and unoffensively.¹³¹ That is why Gandhi calls the pickets by the dignified names of watchmen and missionaries. The picket's duty is essentially to enter into argument with the wrong-doers, to entreat them and to beg of them. If in spite of this they wish to court 'slavery', they ought to have the freedom to do so, for it is our duty to extend to others the same freedom that we want for ourselves.¹³²

As such, this method was employed by Gandhi for the first time during his South African satyagraha movement against the Asiatic Permit offices.¹³³ In India, it was employed during the First and Second Non-violent Non-cooperation Movements mainly against the sale and use of foreign cloth and liquor shops.

PEACEFUL RAIDS: The method of peaceful raids is an advanced stage of boycott and peaceful picketing. The satyagraha adopting this method is vindictive and, in order to bring economic pressure and the pressure of public opinion on his opponent, does the maximum harm to the latter's goods, though not to his person. It is peaceful in the sense that no injury is done to the person of the opponent. In peaceful raids, the satyagrahis, in violation of law, deliberately indulge in the act of looting. They take away the goods despite the adversary's resistance, for they deem the lost to be a commodity meant for universal consumption and not for monopolisation or storage. During the Salt Satyagraha (1930), peaceful raids were made on various salt depots and the raiders took

away thousands of myriads of salt under showers of lashes and bullets.¹²⁰

PROTEST DEMONSTRATION: To resign from the Assembly or Council as a mark of protest against the official policy is another method which manifested itself during a number of satyagraha movements. Members and sympathisers of the Congress resigned from the Imperial Legislative Council, the Governor-General's Council, the Council of India and the Provincial Legislative Councils.¹²¹

FASTING (IVEN TO DEATH): Fasting is perhaps the greatest and the most effective weapon in the satyagraha armoury. It is to be undertaken either for self-purification or self-restraint or for appealing to the better nature of the opposite party in order to make him reconsider his stand and redress his wrong.¹²² It may be undertaken to check acts of violence, to remove bitterness or even to purify the political atmosphere.¹²³ It, however, is to be employed only as 'a species of *tyaga*', and never as a method of compelling undue pressure on the opposite party.¹²⁴

Fastings should, moreover, be undertaken only by an 'expert' and by him, too, only according to his capacity to fast.¹²⁵ It should be undertaken only on rare occasions, only as a last resort and only in obedience to the call of one's conscience.¹²⁶

As such, fasting was undertaken by Gandhi on as many as sixteen occasions. Of these, three fasts were against official injustice, four against the practice of untouchability, three against Hindu-Muslim riots and four against other acts of violence. Further, three of his fasts were for self-purification and penance, one to encourage the Ahmedabad mill workers in the strike, which they were quitting on his advice, in order to secure an increase in their wages. In terms of duration, on seven occasions he undertook fasts to death, on three occasions for twenty-one days, on another three for seven days and on one occasion each for one day, three days five days and fourteen days respectively, fasting thus for a total period of 138 days.¹²⁷

NON-POSSESSION: The strategy of non-possession or voluntary renunciation of property is employed to urge upon the government that it cannot force the people to cooperate with it or obey its commands against their will. It is to convert that the government does not forcibly realize its dues by seizure and confiscation of the defaulter's property or possessions. The strategy is to declare one's property (by dedicating it for public purpose, debanding it, or selling or donating it to someone who is not a defaulter) in anticipation of its seizure and confiscation by the government.¹²⁸ This method was employed by Gandhi during the Bardoli Satyagraha (1928), the Salt Satyagraha (1930), and the Second Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement (1932).

CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM: The purpose of the constructive program is to achieve economic self-sufficiency and inculcate the *swadishi* spirit amongst the masses. It can be employed also for the promotion of con-

racial harmony and the removal of social evils like untouchability, unemployment and illiteracy. As a species of total non-cooperation with the British rule in India, it was employed also to replace governmental institutions with voluntary public (national) institutions.¹²⁴

The constructive program as a method of satyagraha was adopted by Gandhi during his First Nonviolent Non-cooperation Movement (1920), the Bardoli Satyagraha (1928), the Salt Satyagraha (1930) and the Individual Satyagraha (1940). However, as a definite method of achieving complete independence, the constructive program found its clear and full exposition only in the post-Individual Satyagraha period of December 1941. It was during this period that Gandhi expounded his whole philosophy of the constructive program and published it in a 25-page booklet entitled *Constructive Program*.¹²⁵

It is through the advocacy and use of these methods that Gandhi delivered his supreme message of substituting willing obedience for forced obedience, and voluntary cooperation for forced cooperation. It is this message that has vouchsafed for Gandhi his unique position in the galaxy of philosophers and reformers. Commenting on Gandhi's philosophy and technique of peaceful protest through satyagraha, Disenker observes: "It is not Gandhi who made satyagraha but satyagraha which has made Gandhi; . . . if it is a matter of obligation between the two, it is satyagraha which has obliged Gandhi [i] rather than the reverse."¹²⁶

Conclusions

In the post-Gandhi era of Indian politics, Gandhi's satyagraha techniques have been identified with practically every form of protest, especially with strikes and boycotts, fasts and threats of self-immolation, dharna and pen-down campaigns, and bandhs and gliters. These forms of protest involve 'pre-judgment', and consequently 'symbolic violence', and are, therefore, a species of *daragraha*, the antithesis of satyagraha. Failure to grasp the spirit of satyagraha has resulted in people's loss of faith in it as a supplement to democracy. To restore their faith in Gandhi's whole philosophy of peaceful protest, the people need to be properly educated and trained before their leaders give them the satyagraha call. Gandhi had employed satyagraha techniques in the twin contexts of apartheid and alien rule. Both were abhorrent situations. In the context of parliamentary democracy, Gandhi's satyagraha techniques need to be reinterpreted so as to ensure that by their inevitable use the spirit and institutions of democracy are properly developed and refined, not destroyed. This can be done with benefit, as demonstrated in the case of Martin Luther King's movement against racial discrimination—the predominantly nonviolent campaign which has established the living influence and the extent of practicability of Gandhi's ideal and technique of satyagraha.

1. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. by Luigi Ricci, Rev. and E.R.P. Vincent (Bombay: Indo Publishing House, 1937) ch. XVIII 31.
2. M.K. Gandhi, *An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth*, trans. by Mahadevi Desai (2d Edn., Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1934) 200; *Varjjan* (Ahmedabad): 14-10-1935, 361-362, 4-10-1946, 341, and 12-6-1947, 200.
3. *Varjjan*, 3-4-1935, 200, *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi—CWMO* (Delhi: The Publications Division, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Government of India) 2 362, CWMO, 12 249.
4. CWMO, 9 135. See also, James Luther Adams, 'Civil Disobedience: Its Concepts And Limits', in *Political and Legal Obligations*, ed. by J.R. Pennock and J.W. Chapman (Newark 218, New York: Atherton Press, 1970) 31.
5. K.L. Shrivastava, *The Ethical Values: A Study of Gandhi's Method And Its Accomplishments* (1 Edn., London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1939) 11-12. For Gandhi's statement see, M.K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha in South Africa*, trans. by V.G. Deras (1 Edn., Madras: S. Ganesan, 1931) 173.
6. CWMO, 8 131, CWMO, 12 13. and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 3, 173-74.
7. *Ibid.*, 171-68.
8. Simone Foster-Buck, *Gandhi Against Machiavellism*, trans. by P. Leco (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1956) 1, 121-36.
9. CWMO, 4 22-23.
10. CWMO, 16 115, CWMO, 18 305, and CWMO, 4 161.
11. CWMO, 9 14-15, 118, CWMO, 12, 305-318, and M.K. Gandhi, *Hand Sewing or Indian Home Rule* (11 Edn., 188 Imp., Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1936) 79.
12. *Varjjan*, 9 7-1936, 171, and CWMO, 10 184.
13. CWMO, 1 45, CWMO, 3 315, CWMO, 4 160, CWMO, 4 25-23, 31, 131, 151; CWMO, 9 21, 30-31, 402. CWMO, 16 346. CWMO, 11 40-41; *Varjjan*, 5-3-1936, 173, 10-12-1938, 346, 11-3-1939, 14, 30-4-1946, 334 and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 3, 173.
14. James Luther Adams, op. cit. 284.
15. Simone Foster-Buck, op. cit., 225-28.
16. Jean V. Bordarieu, 'Satyagraha Versus Durgartha', *Gandhi: His Achievements For Our Times*, ed. by G. Ramachandran and T.K. Mahadevan (1 Edn., Bombay: Bharatya Vidya Bhavan, 1960) 67-81. See also CWMO, 16 363, for Gandhi's views on durgartha. See also S.G. Bhaze, 'Satyagraha And Democracy', *Gandhi Marg*, V 1, No. 4, 283-290.
17. D.G. Tandelkar, *Mahatma: Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi* (1 Edn., Bombay: V.K. Narayan and D.G. Tandelkar, 1935) 91, 16. See also, W.S. Mahon, 'Impact of Nonviolence on the American Negro', *Gandhi Marg*, V 13, No. 4, 284.
18. *Varjjan*, 9-6-1935, 4; 10-6-1946, 204, 20-7-1947, 248. See also CWMO, 7 111, CWMO 9 36-37, and Pyattal, *Gandhi's Correspondence With the Government 1947-49* (11 Edn., Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1949) 41. For confirmation of Gandhi's views, see also, Gena Sharp, 'Gandhi's Defense Policy', *Gandhi Marg*, V, No. 3, 189-91, Harry French, 'Towards An Ethics of Civil Disobedience', *Editor* (Chicago) V, LXXVII, No. 3, 175, and James Luther Adams, op. cit., 365-394.
19. CWMO, 12 264-66, 483.
20. Ram Narain, *Gandhi's Concept of Political Obligations* (1 Edn., Calcutta: The Mahatma Association, 1972) 177, n. 40.
21. *Varjjan*, 10-3-1946, 134 and 9-7-1934, 175. See also, Aditya Aditya, 'The Place of Satyagraha in Democracy', *A L.C.C. Research Review* (New Delhi) V IX, No. 33, 15-16.

22. *Harjan*, 6-9-1917, 112, and CWMG, 19-202.
23. Henry Ponsch, *op. cit.*, 176.
24. Ram Ratnam, *op. cit.*, 111-14.
25. *Harjan*, 10-12-1938, 269.
26. R. R. Dunshee, *Is Met Gandhi The Answer?* (1 Edn.) (Bombay) Bhawanji Vidya Bhawan, 1961) 49-50. See also, Arun Mehta, *Gandhi and the Nuclear Age* (New Jersey: The Bodley Head Press, 1963) 125-26.
27. *Harjan*, 1942-1955, 509, 548-1947, 250.
28. *Harjan*, 7-7-1934, 173, 30-9-1939, 283, 30-3-1946, 44-45, 25-6-1947, 221, and CWMG, 3, 36-37.
29. M. K. Gandhi, *The Indian Voter's Problem* (1 Edn.) (Ahmedabad: Nirajana Publishing House, 1941) 65.
30. Thomas Marjan, 'The Meaning of Satyagraha', *Gandhi Mary*, V, X, No. 2, 110-12.
31. *Harjan*, 5-4-1931, 4, 3-4-1939, 19, 24-4-1939, 163, and M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 311.
32. CWMG, 9, 100; CWMG, 17, 493.
33. *Harjan*, 4-5-1939, 113. See also G. Ramachandran, 'Gandhi Still Follows The Way', *Gandhi Mary*, V, XI, No. 1, 62. Brackets mine.
34. *Ibid.*, 62. See also CWMG, 10, 127.
35. *Harjan*, 10-8-1945, 64.
36. Richard B. Gregg, 'Satyagraha As A Mirror', *op. cit.*, supra n. 16, 40-43.
37. Ram Ratnam, *op. cit.*, 110-113, 110-112.
38. D. G. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, 1931, III, 303-49.
39. CWMG, 30, 100, and *Harjan*, 24-6-1938, 173.
40. Mahatma Wilson, *Gandhian Experiences On Disobedience, War and Citizenship* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954) 3-4.
41. CWMG, 19, 210; and M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 179-78.
42. CWMG, 8, 9.
43. Ram Ratnam, *op. cit.*, 179-78.
44. CWMG, 13, 263-69.
45. CWMG, 14, 136.
46. M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 312-43, and D. G. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, 1931, II, 285-19.
47. *Ibid.*, 1931, II, 31-34, 111-17, *ibid.*, 1932, III, 345-48, CWMG, 13, 219-24, 11 M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 2, 446.
48. D. G. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, 1931, II, 184-200, *ibid.*, 1934, VII, 131-23, and 304-305.
49. M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 321.
50. CWMG, 9, 90; CWMG, 12, 184-97.
51. CWMG, 8, 44-62.
52. Simon Foster-Brock, *op. cit.*, 42.
53. *Ibid.*, 63. See also, *op. cit.*, supra n. 1, 1969, XII, 350-31.
54. W. H. Morris Jones, 'Mahatma Gandhi—Political Philosopher?' *Political Studies* (Oxford) V, VII, No. 1, 35-36.
55. CWMG, 1, 37.
56. CWMG, 4, 302, *Harjan*, 1-4-1939, 71, and 24-6-1939, 179.
57. CWMG, 13, 436-37, CWMG, 14, 144, 171, 213-56, CWMG, 17, 39, M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 373-80; M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 2, D. G. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, 1931, I, 190; D. G. Tendulkar, *Gandhi In Champaran* (Delhi: The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1937) 1-2; Rajendra Prasad, *Satyagraha In Champaran* (Ahmedabad: Nirajana Publishing

- House, (1948) 191-193, 119; R.R. Dinkar, *Satyagraha: Its Technique And History* (Bombay: Hind Kashi, 1948) 180, and N.D. Parekh, *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* (Ahmedabad: Navyarn Publishing House, 1956) II, 343-44.
38. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 13, 1931, III, 268, 279, 346-467 and N.K. Bose, *Mp Daga Gandhi* (Calcutta: Nishana, 1953) 40, 148, 165-68, 284, 299, 303, 323, 336-40, 354, 372, 376-79, 384.
39. Ram Ratan, op. cit., 267-68.
40. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 11, 88, and CWMG, 9: 34, 316, CWMG, 10: 73, and CWMG, 12: 449.
41. CWMG, 12: 4.
42. CWMG, 14: 248-15, 367, and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 148.
43. CWMG, 4: 484, CWMG, 9: 183, CWMG, 14: 149, CWMG, 23: 102; *Marjies* 28-15-1936, 339, 15-1-1937, 337; 26-5-1945, 194, 25-7-1946, 294; 13-1-1947, 488; 13: 6-1947, 199, and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 11, 46, 49.
44. CWMG, 6: 326, CWMG, 13: 603-12, CWMG, 14: 144, CWMG, 15: 113, CWMG, 16: 12, M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 435, 471, D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1952, III, 372-73; ibid., 1954, VIII, 346-48, and J.S. Sharma, *Indian National Congress & Descriptive Bibliography of India's Struggle for Freedom* (Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 1959) 618, 614. About the establishment of the Mass Indian Congress, see op. cit. supra n. 1, 1836, I, 156. The date of its establishment recorded by Gandhi is his Autobiography is incorrect. See M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 167.
45. Anna Mass, op. cit., 134-35.
46. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 476-71.
47. Ibid., and Joan V. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall University Press, 1958) 82.
48. Ibid., 94, and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 13, 1951, II, 6.
49. M.K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha: Nonviolent Resistance* (Ahmedabad: Navayarn Publishing House, 1960) 37.
50. CWMG, 12: 388, CWMG, 1: 1, CWMG, 12: 449.
51. *Marjies*, 7-7-1946, 215.
52. *Marjies* 28: 6-1939, 443; and CWMG, 15: 16.
53. CWMG, 13: 348-69, CWMG, 14: 113, 199; CWMG, 15: 162-163; CWMG, 17: 30-34, D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1951, II, 197; ibid., 1952, III, 25, 190-91, 198, 243, 260 263-64, ibid., 1953, V, 62, 423-25, and R.L. Farquar, *The Indomitable Sardar* (Bombay: Bhambay Vidyut Bhawan, 1962) 54-55.
54. *Marjies*, 6-10-1946, 341.
55. CWMG, 18: 367, and *Marjies* 21-6-1947, 200.
56. *Marjies*, 14-15-1956, 184, M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 11, 73-75, CWMG, 19: 43; and R.D.L. Parashar, 'Ind To A Tree', *Gandhi Marg*, V: 1, No. 4, 127-30.
57. *Marjies* 3: 4-1946, 72, 7-7-1946, 312, and CWMG, 4: 348.
58. CWMG, 15: 423-24, CWMG, 16: 86, *From India* (Ahmedabad) 20-1-1930, 31.
59. CWMG, 9: 320, and *Marjies*, 23-3-1942, 81.
60. *Marjies*, 21-9-1946, 317.
61. CWMG, 3: 403.
62. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1952, III, 193-93.
63. Ibid., 193, 215; ibid., 1953, VI, 325, 326, and R.R. Dinkar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 173.
64. Joan V. Bondurant, op. cit. supra n. 47, 93-94.
65. CWMG, 13: 258-60, 263-65, 267-68, 637-38; and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1953, I, 363, 372.
66. Ibid., 1953, III, 30, 31-33.
67. Ibid., 388-82.

88. CWMG, 19: 113, 127-28, and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 469-64.
89. CWMG, 16, 262; CWMG, 18: 280; CWMG, 18: 304-105, 221; and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 181, II, 32.
90. *Ibid.*, 1932, III, 10-12.
91. *Ibid.*, 1932, III, 54, 55; S. Sharma, op. cit., 33, 327, 335-36, and R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 173.
92. CWMG, 2: 1, 32, 39; CWMG, 3: 51, 221, 241; and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 297.
93. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 294; and CWMG, 19: 6-7.
94. CWMG, 14, 236, 260-61; CWMG, 19: 199-21, 216-17, 262-264, 321, 322; Jean V. Boudier, op. cit. supra n. 37, 53; and R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 111.
95. Ram Ratan, op. cit., 231.
96. Jean V. Boudier, op. cit. supra n. 37, 36, 297.
97. *Ibid.*, 193-19; and CWMG, 5: 463.
98. CWMG, 7: 331, 332, and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 233.
99. K.L. Shridharan, op. cit., 36.
100. CWMG, 14: 214-23, 215-26.
101. CWMG, 12: 241, 254-55.
102. *Harjan*, 14-5-1942, 183-87; 21-5-1942, 96, 11-4-1943, 307, and 18-4-1947, 274.
103. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 216-17.
104. *Harjan*, 13-10-1939, 280, and 6-4-1946, 73.
105. CWMG, 7: 33-34, 241, 257, 330-34; CWMG, 8: 214-23, 263, 269-80, 432; CWMG, 9: 103, 304-17; CWMG, 13: 113-16, 123, 128-30, and CWMG, 12: 104, 133-36.
106. CWMG, 13: 167-72, 617; CWMG, 15: 199-24, 216-17; D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 124-27, 134, 182; *ibid.*, 1932, III, 49, 74, 264, 266; R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 153-54, 164, 173; and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 460-62.
107. *Harjan*, 24-7-1946, 237.
108. *Harjan*, 18-4-1940, 253; 24-5-1942, 162; D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1931, III, 1-3, 7-9, 16-18, 26, 30-31, 34, 42-43, 46-47, 52-54, 178, 241, 257; *ibid.*, 1932, IV, 213, 234, *ibid.*, 1932, V, 403, 405, 407, 420, *ibid.*, 1933, VI, 95, 94-95, 193-202, 308, 327, 313-16, 324, 326, 367; M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 462, 498; R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 157, 164, 176-78, 183-85; CWMG, 28: 137.
109. *Harjan*, 14-7-1946, 239.
110. K.L. Shridharan, op. cit., 44-45.
111. CWMG, 14: 234-75.
112. R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 121-22.
113. Jean V. Boudier, op. cit. supra n. 37, 37; and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 193.
114. *Ibid.*, 58; Jean V. Boudier, op. cit. supra n. 37, 55; and *Young India*, 10-23-1931, 427.
115. Jean V. Boudier, op. cit. supra n. 37, 37; and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 193.
116. *Harjan*, 11-5-1942, 262-63.
117. CWMG, 8: 283.
118. CWMG, 8: 421.
119. CWMG, 8: 417, 418; CWMG, 9: 126; CWMG, 12: 501.
120. CWMG, 9: 187.
121. Ram Ratan, op. cit., 232-33.
122. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 346.
123. CWMG, 8: 433.
124. CWMG, 13: 549.
125. CWMG, 13: 51.

126. CWMG, 6: 265
127. CWMG, 7: 323-34, 443-44, 530-33; CWMG, 8: 456-57; CWMG, 9: 462, CWMG, 10: 343-54, CWMG, 11: 508-509, 515-16, 593-98
128. CWMG, 10: 504-506, 525, 531. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1931, II, 13, 13-14, 40-43, 69, 75-76, 83-84, *ibid.*, 1952, III, 134-45, 199, and J.S. Sharma, op. cit. 473-75, 481, 520.
129. K.L. Paragkar, op. cit., 59, and Jean V. Bondurant, op. cit. supra n. 47, 53-55
130. CWMG, 9: 40
131. CWMG, 3: 158
132. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 3, 219 (c) 1
133. K.L. Shrivastava, op. cit., 39. R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 122, 172; J.S. Sharma, op. cit., 478-79, 484, 486, 493, D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1931, II, 44, 53, 69, and *ibid.*, 1952, III, 33, 44
134. *Ibid.*, 1952, III, 50-52; and R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 165-166
135. J.S. Sharma, op. cit., 457-58, 462, 471, 483, 482, 507, 526, *Indian Review* (Madras) V XXII, No. 3, p. 799, Jean V. Bondurant, op. cit. supra n. 47, 53-54, 94; R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 123, K.L. Paragkar, op. cit., 60-62, and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 34, 44
136. *Marjani* 11-3-1939, 46-47; 24-7-1942, 248; 5-10-1947, 354; 21-11-1948, 531. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 121, 152, 342-43. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 29, 515, CWMG, 21: 352-43, 392, and Mahadev Desai, *The Story of Gandhi's Action or The Gita According to Gandhi* (1 Edn., IV Imp.; Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1951) 168
137. *Herder* 11-3-1939, 47, 26-7-1942, 248, and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1952, III, 249-50
138. *Ibid.*, 1952, III, 159. *Herder*, 4-3-1933, 1; 11-3-1938, 47, 13-16-1943, 122; 28-7-1947, 244, and CWMG, 25: 201
139. *Marjani* 11-3-1939, 46; 25-11-1939, 349; 24-7-1942, 248, and *Pravda*, op. cit., 52
140. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 29, 513, CWMG, 21: 467, *Marjani*, 11-3-1939, 46; 10-13-1945, 24; 21-4-1946, 53; 12-8-1947, 394, 14-8-1947, 318 and 23-3-1948, 155.
141. Ben Guttan, op. cit., 283-93
142. Mahadev Desai, *The Story of Gandhi* (1 Edn., Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1957) 129
143. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1952, III, 239-40.
144. *Ibid.*, 1951, II, 13, R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 157, and Jean V. Bondurant, op. cit. supra n. 47, 55
145. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1953, VI, 21-24, *Marjani*, 14-1-1946, 417; 18-6-1948, 178, and 21-3-1948, 261
146. R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 31.

Gandhi Marg

TITLE, AUTHOR, SUBJECT-IN-TITLE INDEX TO VOLUME SIXTEEN 1972

- Action, faith and, rediscovery of 187
- American officials, Gandhi, civil disobedience and 45
- Anand, Mukh Raj 105, 212
- Andrews, Demabandha, a communist tribute 15
- Appadorai, A. 99
- Bag, M.R.A. 104
- Bala-christmanan, Y. 97
- Bangla Desh and all that it is direct 5
- Bangla Desh, India after 85
- Bangla Desh, India and 237
- Bangla Desh's historic destiny 81
- Birth of a nation in blood and tears 1
- Bishop, Donald H. 16
- Brigades 229
- Bristol, James E. 266
- Byles, Marie B. 152, 252
- Civil disobedience and American officials, Gandhi 45
- The continuity of offensiveness and the covenant of peace 258
- Conciliation, resistance and, the Via Yang of 192
- Das, Durga 89
- Demabandha Andrews, a communist tribute 15
- Dehghande, A.S. 29
- Desai, R.R. 121, 163
- Douglas, James W. 192
- Ecological crisis, India and 157
- Edwards I., B., 157, 235
- Ends and means 76
- Environment, human, problems of 212
- Faith, action and, rediscovery of 187
- A foreign policy for peace 234
- Friedman, Maurice 238
- The future of nonviolence in social change 179
- Future population trends and prospects 256
- Gandhi, a meditation on 8
- Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed, meditations on 189
- Gandhi and Tolstoy, religion and political process in 278
- Gandhi, civil disobedience and American officials 45
- Gandhi, M.K. 167
- Gandhi, not back to but forward to 235
- Gandhian: a political interpretation 81
- Gandhian, principles and postulates of 29
- Gargis Jr., W. Lawrence 147
- Goold, James Warren 179
- Gupta, Siva 98
- Hyslop, Thomas 269
- India after Bangla Desh 85
- India, ancient, theory of resistance in 57
- India and Bangla Desh 227
- India and the ecological crisis 157
- The India-Pakistan crisis at the

- United Nations 124
- Force not so obvious but of concern to the world community 121
- Iyer, V R. Krishna 111
- Jack, Henry A. 117, 124
- Jan, Ghislai 87
- Jha, Manomayan 45
- The king's new clothes 162
- Linton, John 227
- Machine, man or 167
- Maitra, K. R. 93
- Manickam, D.R. 91
- Man or machine? 167
- A meditation on Gandhi 8
- Meditations on Gandhi and the Apostolic Creed 289
- Mishra, G.L. 94
- Monkberg, S.D. 74
- Morkhandriat, R.S. 57
- Mumford, Lewis 171
- Needful basis of violence and non-violence 132
- Newcombe, Alan G. 294
- Nonviolence not first for export 288
- Nonviolence, in social change, future of 179
- Nonviolence, presuppositions of 18
- Nonviolence, violence and, needful basis of 132
- Not back to but forward to Gandhi 735
- Outline of a peace studies program 308
- Patel, B. K. 114
- Peace, a foreign policy for 254
- Peace studies program, a, outline of 308
- Peace, covenant of, and the community of others 238
- The Pentagon of power 171
- Population, future, trends and prospects 258
- Power, the Pentagon of 171
- The presuppositions of nonviolence 18
- Principles and postulates of Gandhism 19
- Problems of the human environment 212
- Ramachandran, G. 15, 187
- Rediscovery of faith and action 187
- Religion and political process in Gandhi and Tolstoy 278
- Resistance, contemplation and, the Yin-Yang of 192
- Resistance, in ancient India, theory of 157
- Sankhdher, M.M. 68
- Sengh, Khushwant 187
- Sti Aureliano's philosophy, its universality 183
- Subrahmanyam, K. 101
- Tauber, Irene B. 258
- Thapar, Romesh 106
- The theory of resistance in ancient India 57
- Thoughts on the road to Stockholm 147
- Tolstoy, Gandhi and, religion and political process in 278
- Tolstoy, Leo 162
- Tucci, G. 8
- Violence, and nonviolence, the needful basis of 132
- Wagner, Chen 278
- The Yin-Yang of resistance and contemplation 192

IN BACK NUMBERS

1965

January

- William R. Miller : Gandhi and King—Pioneers of Modern Nonviolence
T.K. Mahadevan : An Approach to the Study of Gandhi
S. Varma : The Four Noble Truths of Gandhi's Social Philosophy

April

- A. Controversy : The Meaning of Gandhi
Robert Payne : The Inheritance of Gandhi
Hélène De Solé Pool : Violence in Villages
Spartak Nelson : Caste and Untouchability—and Gandhi

July

- R.R. Diwaker : The Lokamanya and the Mahatma
Shabani Bhattacharya : Some Reflections on Gandhi the Writer
Esme Wynne-Tyson : Gandhi and the God-Idea
S. M. Tiwari : Four Questions on Gandhi's Philosophy

October

- Jayaprakash Narayan : Gandhi and Social Revolution
A. S. Deshpande : Gandhian Social Philosophy
Rosalind Schama : The Obligations of the Individual
B. Lytle : Gandhi's Personality as a Source of his Influence

1970

January

- Donald H. Bishop : Gandhism and Dissent in America
George Lukes : Strategy for Non-violent Revolution
James E. Bristol : The Draft Recall Movement in the United States
Johanna Bosch : Erikson's Gandhi

April

- T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Advaita of Mahatma Gandhi
K. G. Salyadein : Gandhi's Loveable Personality
P. Nagaraja Rao : The Gandhian Concept of Dharma
Lyn Bowmen : Totalitarianism or Nonviolence?

July

- Paul F. Power : Gandhi's View of Citizenship
K. Senthanam : Gandhi's Way of Life
R. R. Diwaker : Dynamics of Ahimsa
Gene Sharp : Gandhi as a National Defence Strategist

October

- Groot Coen : The Gans : 1914-1918
James D. Hunt : Thoreau and Gandhi : A Re-evaluation of the Legacy
T. K. Mahadevan : Gandhi Study in the Seventies
T. K. N. Unnikrishnan : Gandhian View of a World Social Order

GANDHI MARS
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

1971

January

William L. Richter : Gandhi and Language : Political Relevance for the Seventies

Stuart Nelson : Nonviolence and India's Independence

(In) Loretta Pastowska : Principles of Gandhi's Public Activity

April

James W. Douglass : The Revolution to the Kingdom

James Warren Gould : The Alternative to War

N. G. S. Kiri : Techniques and Tools of Gandhian Revolution

K. Gupleswar : Gandhi's Views on Law and Justice

July

Gerald Harewitz : The Idea of a Mass Deontic Movement

Johan Galtung : Peace Research

C. N. Patel : Erikson's Gandhi

V. V. Ramana Murti : Gandhi and Nehru : Dialogue to Debate

October

Karek Khanna : Individualistic Trends in Gandhian Thought

Edwin King : Lohia and the U. S. Civil Rights Movement

Charles C. Walker : Nonviolent Action and the U.S. Navy

Ramakrishna Venkay : Gandhi and Technical Education

1972

January

G. Teets : A Meditation on Gandhi
Donald H. Bishop : The Presuppositions of Nonviolence

Manoranjan Jha : Gandhi, Civil Disobedience and American Officials

R.S. Mohandasakar : The Theory of Resistance in Ancient India

April

Symposium : India After Bangla Desh

Homer A. Jack : The India-Pakistan Crisis at the U.N.

W. L. Georges Jr. : Thoughts on the Road to Stockholm

Merle B. Sykes : Needful Basis of Violence and Nonviolence

July

Lewis Mumford : The Pentagon of Power

James Warren Gould : The Future of Nonviolence in Social Change

R. R. Diwaker : Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy : Its Universality

James W. Douglass : The Yia-Yang of Resistance and Contemplation

October

Maurice Friedman : The Community of Otherness and the Co-vent of Peace

James E. Bristol : Nonviolence not First for Export

James J. Preston : Religion and Political Process in Gandhi and Tolstoy

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

17/2



Vol. 17. No. 2. APRIL. 1973

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

GANDHI MARG

□ HASER ON THE THREAT SOCIETY □ FRANKLIN
ON THE MANIA OF MOBILITY □ OVERY ON RADICALISM AND REVOLUTION □ MALHOTRA ON
CONTEXTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF GANDHI □
□ BYLES ON WORK AS SELF-EFFACEMENT □

IN BACK NUMBERS

1967

January

V. S. Narayana : Some Reflections on Optimism
William Robert Miller : Violence and the Christian Ethic
Josephine Holcomb : Gandhi at the Round Table Conference
P. Nagendra Rao : Gandhi and the Hindu Concept of Atimesa

April

Thomas Merton : Terror and the Absurd
Theodor Ebert : The Meaning of Nonviolent Resistance
Jerzy Sawicki : The Perspectives of Peace Research
Horace Alexander : Ends and Means in the Pursuit of Peace

July

Martin Luther King : The Casualties of the War in Vietnam
John R. Resser : The Concept of Deterrence
R. R. Dawkins : Gandhi and Man in Evolution
Theodor Ebert : Nonviolence : Doctrine or Technique?

October

J. B. Kripalani : The Meaning of Swadeshi
Donald H. Bishop : Gandhi and the Concept of Love
Karen Monson and Martin Grotzahn : Racial Prejudice and the Incest Taboo
T. V. Perera : Tilak and Gandhi

1968

January

Martin Luther King : The Crisis in America's Cities
Merle B. Byles : Truth is God
Jayaprakash Narayan : The Outlook for Peace in India
Regh David Abernathy : Religion and World Peace

April

Robert Steele : The American Dream Becomes a Nightmare
Bo Winmark : The Changing Ideology of Nonviolence
T.K. Mahadevan : Democracy and the New Generation
Noam Chomsky : The Revolutionary Pacifism of A. J. Muste

July

Maurice Friedman : Martin Luther King As American Gandhi and a Modern Job
Mylford G. Sibley : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Revolution
Steven Nelson : Black Power and the Poor People's Campaign
Adam Roberts : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Resistance

October

James W. Douglass : Is there a Politics without Violence?
Geoffrey Ashe : Can Nonviolence Change Society?
H.J.N. Horsburgh : Nonviolence and Impotence
R. R. Dawkins : Truth and Nonviolence : New Dimensions

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

GANDHI MARG 65

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME SEVENTEEN NUMBER TWO APRIL 1973

Editors

G. Ramachandran

T. K. Mahadevan

Editorial Board

R. R. Diwakar

J. B. Kripalani

Jayaprakash Narayan

Abid Hussain

Vijaya Hari

G. Ramachandran

Shrikanth Narayan

Bhawan Prasad Mishra

Radhakrishna

Davendra Kumar Gupta

T. K. Mahadevan (Convener)

Contents

Editorials	107	The tragic statement
	110	Limits to knowledge
John R. Ruse	115	The threat society
Roger Franklin	126	'Is your journey necessary?'
L. Jesudasan	133	A poetic celebration of the Mahatma's martyrdom
Cecilie Maierlein	138	Martyrdom of Gandhi
Bob Overly	141	Approaches to nonviolent revolution
S. L. Malhotra	150	Some characteristics of Gandhi's thought
Thomas Hyslop	158	Madrigals on Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed—II
Marie B. Byles	167	What is the most worthwhile work?

Rs. 7.50 a year in South Asia; \$ 2.50 elsewhere; postfree. Rs. 3.00 (\$ 1.00) the copy. Payment in advance. Publication dates: 15 Jan., 15 Apr., 15 Jul., 15 Oct. Correspondents about non-manuscript: (delayed) within 15 days; (Review) within 30 days. Remittances by bank drafts or postal or money order only. Published by T. K. Mahadewan for the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 120-123 Dron Dajal Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi and printed by him at the Kaper Printing Press, New Delhi. [Library of Congress Card No. 39-43114]

Editorials

THE TRAGIC STALEMATE

Indo-Pakistan relations still continue to be tragic beyond words. Never once since the partition of India has there been even a spasm of genuine goodwill between the two nations. Both India and Pakistan have lived in a state of armed neutrality and confrontation. Three times we have had eruptions of war. India is convinced that she never was the aggressor and Pakistan has convinced herself that every time she was defending her honour and integrity. World opinion has shifted and swung from one side to another as it suited the self-interest of the powers concerned. On a clear and broad basis, however, international opinion has aimed to create a balance of power between India and Pakistan.

In the earlier wars, which ended in settlements brought about by the intervention of bigger powers, even while the world knew that India had the upper hand in the battles that were fought, Pakistan had sought to create the fiction that if there had been no settlement it would have smashed India! The unchangeable Pakistani idea was always that one Pakistan soldier was the equal of five Indian soldiers and that in a war to the finish the Pakistan army could start Delhi within a few weeks. On previous occasions this fiction probably paid some dividend to the reputation of Pakistan. But in the last war nothing was left to conjecture or to the delectable art of fiction. The Indian army won an outright and complete victory in the east, with the result that the entire body of Pakistani troops in Bangladesh surrendered unconditionally. In the west, all the concentrated might of Pakistani armour failed to hold the ground against India. President Nixon has revealed that the Indian army was poised for an unprecedented victory on the western front also. But as soon as the war of liberation in Bangladesh was over, India declared a unilateral truce which Pakistan accepted with alacrity. The world, including Pakistan, no longer believes in the story of one Pakistani soldier being equal to five Indian soldiers. This nonsense is now dead as a doornail. In the reported words of a distinguished British Army

Officer, military action by the Indian army in Bangladesh was one of the quickest, most brilliantly executed and thorough known in the annals of modern warfare.

The above facts are adduced not in a spirit of braggadocio. It is just an unadorned statement of facts. No one doubts any more that the Indian army won an complete victory as any army in the world at any time. But Prime Minister Indira Gandhi proved herself to be a genius in this situation. What she demonstrated was not her genius for war but her greater genius for peace. She not only declared unilateral truce after having won the war but took the astonishing step of negotiating for a durable peace. She assumed no pose of a victor. Her approach to Pakistan after victory was that of a genuine friend who had not the slightest idea of humiliating Pakistan. With high-minded generosity she held out her hand of friendship and cooperation to defeated Pakistan. She never said a word or made any gesture of a conqueror. She was almost diffident for the victory she was compelled to win.

It would be of considerable interest to compare for a moment the so-called unilateral truce which China threw in the face of India after her brief military incursion in the north-east of India. China found that in a mad moment of anger and false prestige she had run her army a little deeper into India than she should have and withdrew her troops calling it a unilateral truce. What did follow? Nothing except the arrogant assumption of victory by China with nothing done to follow up the truce, if it was a truce at all. The ugly gulf between China and India has continued for years with only some small thaw in recent months. But look at the example set by India after completely winning the war with Pakistan and with Pakistan surrendering unconditionally. India went out of her way to invite Pakistan to settle across peacefully across the table. As a result the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India met in Simla and thrashed out an agreement of peace and goodwill.

The Simla agreement, excellent in itself, was more significant for what it could lead to. The President and the Prime Minister parted as good friends. Mahatma Gandhi had always emphasized that nonviolence to be worth the name should be that of the strong and not the weak. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi handling with magnificent courage, patience and goodwill the liberation of Bangladesh from a terrible tyranny, solving at one stroke after long travail the problem of ten million refugees cast on the soil of India by the same tyranny and then suddenly switching from war to peace, proved herself to be the greatest Gandhian of our time in regard to this vital and complex issue.

But alas, President Bhutto has again proved how unpredictable he is as the leader of Pakistan. He is still in the grip of his old mania

for confrontation with India as though that attitude alone can build up his prestige in Pakistan. He swears he will never agree to India's hegemony in the sub-continent. This is a fantastic repudiation of something which India has never sought. India has never aimed at the hegemony of the sub-continent. Not a word from the Prime Minister of India, nor any gesture of her Government can be focused to indicate that India is seeking this hegemony. It was Pandit Nehru who had, in his day, repeatedly affirmed that India aimed at no leadership in the sub-continent or in Asia or anywhere.

The present Prime Minister is in line with the realistic and nobly humble attitude of her great father. She has made it clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that her aim is friendship and cooperation among the three equals in the sub-continent, namely, Pakistan, Bangladesh and India. She seeks no undue advantage from the triumph of the Indian army in Bangladesh. She has proved this by action in the surrender of territories acquired in the war and the return of all prisoners taken on the western front. It does not, however, seem to suit President Bhutto to accept the friendship and goodwill of India. He continues to indulge in shadow fighting. Can anything be more injurious to Pakistan than the non-recognition of Bangladesh, which is now an unbreakable reality within the family of nations and sovereign states. Even some of the Arab nations, and the United States itself, among nearly a hundred countries, have recognised Bangladesh.

Nothing is today more ridiculous than for Pakistan to still talk of an East Pakistan, which is no more. While President Bhutto is finding it extraordinarily difficult to frame a constitution and hold together, in friendship and cooperation, the provinces of Sind, Baluchistan, Pakhtoonistan and West Punjab, Bangladesh within record time has evolved its own constitution and held the first general elections under it. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman is now for the second time holding power by the unanimous verdict of his people. Pakistan can get all its prisoners of war released tomorrow if President Bhutto has the common sense to come to terms with the reality of Bangladesh.

India is no enemy of Pakistan, nor will Bangladesh be an enemy of Pakistan. President Bhutto is his own enemy and he is already paying a heavy price in the opposition and uncertainties he has himself created in West Pakistan. The tragic stalemate between India and Pakistan is his achievement. Is destiny setting its trap for this well-intentioned but volatile leader of Pakistan that he should not escape the consequences of his own past actions? President Bhutto should know that the world still remembers how he abetted in the destruction of Bangladesh through sheer brutality under Yahya Khan. The longer the President delays in settling with Bangladesh and India, the tighter would be destiny's rope round his neck. We can only exclaim in wonder and sorrow why what

is so obvious except his restless mind.

India would wish nothing better than that President Bhutto is able to hold the component parts of West Pakistan firmly together in friendship and cooperation and thus establish a great and democratic republic under his leadership. Nothing would suit India better. But India can do nothing to help President Bhutto against himself. Let him not abet fate in preparing a tragic fate for himself. How we wish he would read the writing on the wall and put himself right with his own people and with Bangladesh without delay. United, prosperous and equal, the treaty of states in the sub-continent can become a mighty bulwark of democracy in Asia and set a shining example of how when enmity among peoples gives place to friendship, it can lead to an explosion of freedom, prosperity and happiness for them all.

G. RAMACHANDRAN

LIMITS TO KNOWLEDGE

We have argued in the recent past that the essence of the present human crisis, for which there are no historical precedents, is that it is a CRISIS OF EXCESS. Man is caught in the vortex of several intermeshing explosions from which there seems no way of escape. Among them, the population explosion is now a byword. So is the explosion of technology—and its concomitant of creeping environmental pollution. But at the root of it all is the KNOWLEDGE EXPLOSION. We know much more than is good for us.

Without being unduly optimistic, one can still take the position that all the explosions except this one are manageable. One can, for example, visualize future technologies which are both non-pollutant and depollutant. One can even hope for populations to begin to stabilize at some point in the foreseeable future and eventually to come down to more flexible levels. The danger of an exploding nuclear war, on the other hand, is already nothing more than an unpleasant memory. What, however, man will find hardest to tame is his exploding knowledge.

The report of the so-called Club of Rome, *Limits to Growth*, is already a warning of a sort. What it communicates is not the final voice of some human being but a computer revelation. The computer, after all, is the modern oracle. When the computer speaks, we must give heed.

Rudely awakened from their day-dreaming, some of the champions of modern technology have begun to question that revelation. For example, in the University of Sussex they claim to have fed the same

information into another computer and come out with different results. On our part, we would rather that the Club of Rome's forebodings turn out to be true. Indeed we would welcome them with open arms. For the sooner we run out of fuel the better. No fuel, no technology. Back to the bullockcart, the plough and the charkhra. Back to the silent contemplation of stars on pitch-dark nights. In other words, the Club of Rome's report, far from being horrifying, is a blessing in disguise.

But it has always been man's fate to get out of one problem only to get into another. For after we shall have got rid of the technological explosion, plus all the other explosions that flow from it, we will still have on our hands the problem of man's expanding knowledge. How are we going to bring *that* under control? The knowledge explosion is a self-propelling, self-accelerating process. It uses liquid state computers (transistors, if you like) and these draw their energy not from fossil fuels but from anything that is humanly edible! Such sources of human food are still plentiful. At any rate, when the collapse of technology shall have brought about an automatic reduction in population, scarcity of food will cease to be a problem.

At the base of the Knowledge Explosion is the Knowledge Industry—probably the most intractable manifestation of man's thirst for power. For above all, knowledge is power and excess of knowledge leads not to wisdom but to an excess of power. And power not only corrupts. Power destroys.

The Knowledge Explosion is destructive in two ways. One of these is expressed in the paradox that 'the more we know the less we know'. In the midst of the super-abundance of collective knowledge, individual men and women are being reduced to such a state of ignorance (euphemistically called speciality) that they are no longer anything more than Chaplinesque cogs in the mega-machine.

Short of a miracle, how will man get over this seemingly insurmountable obstacle? By a simple device. By an act of renunciation. By agreeing to set limits to human knowledge. By rejecting the myth that knowledge is an end in itself. By refusing to play God and by cutting human knowledge to human size.

Renunciation—that is the magic word. We have talked endlessly of socialization of knowledge without reaching anywhere. Similarly ineffective has been the notion of works (discrimination). Men just are incapable of discriminating between what is beneficial and what is pleasurable—and making the right choice.

But men are still capable of renouncing, of calling a halt. Thus far and no farther. The recent agreement between the two super-powers to give up the race for ABM systems is a fair example of what is feasible. The residual capability in man is our last hope.

Let the capture of the Knowledge Industry, the scientists above all,

work towards achieving this act of resurrection. Let them begin now, before it is too late.

Let all nations (both the highly advanced and the less advanced) see the writing on the wall and cooperate in formulating a universal declaration on Limits to Knowledge.

T. K. MAHADEVAN

Gandhi Marg

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP AND OTHER PARTICULARS

Place of Publication	New Delhi
Periodicity of Publication	Quarterly
Publisher's Name	T. K. Mahadevan
Nationality	Indian
Address	228 & 229 Dasm Bazar Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi
Publisher's Name	T. K. Mahadevan
Nationality	Indian
Address	221 & 224 Dasm Bazar Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi
Editor's Name	G. Ramachandran & T. K. Mahadevan
Nationality	Indian
Address	228 & 229 Dasm Bazar Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi
Name and address of individuals who own the journal	The Journal is owned by the Gandhi Trust Foundation, 221 & 224 Dasm Bazar Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi

I, T. K. Mahadevan, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated, 15 April 1951

Sd. T. K. Mahadevan
Publisher

The threat society

JOHN R. KASER

DURING SEVERAL YEARS OF SERIOUS RESEARCH and questioning I have become increasingly convinced that the major institutions of human culture—at least as they have developed in the West—are built upon foundations of threat. Why should this be so? Perhaps it is a cultural accident, perhaps it is innate in our natures, perhaps we are just not yet far enough removed from our heritage of tooth and claw to have discovered a better way. In America especially, it seems to me, the reliance upon threats to produce both stability and change—depending upon which is desired—has been carried to the extreme. This is the pervasive germ which implants our body politic with the mark of the beast.

There are those who would certainly dispute with this point of view. Herbert Marcuse, for example, sometimes makes the claim that unlike most societies of the past, advanced industrial society is organized around a reward system rather than a threat system. The oppressed of the culture are not driven into their oppression, rather they are misled and seduced into it. I believe that this is true only in very limited areas inside industrial societies and true almost not at all in their dealings with the rest of the world. For the most part, it is clear to me that the driving force of social order is threat. The entire legal system, from traffic control through tax and civil law to criminal sanctions, is based on threats. So is the conduct of foreign relations from 'containment' through nuclear deterrence. So too, though perhaps to a lesser extent, are our child-rearing and educational practices, for in these areas also it is the fear of punishment or failure which is relied upon to motivate 'correct' behaviour. In industrial relations, professional activities, race relations, protest movements, and even in religion, the use of threats is, if not ubiquitous, certainly a fundamental feature.

If we are to begin to comprehend why what is happening in America and the world is happening, we must begin to explore the dynamics of

threats. Only if it begins to become clearer how people and groups react to their etc., only if we begin to understand how and when they work and how and when they do not work as behaviour controlling devices, only when we begin to glimpse the complex relationships between a steady diet of threats as a culture and the overall shape of that culture, only then will we begin to gain some hints as to how we might make the transition to a different kind of world, a world in which a new dynamic force has been found to replace that hoary one which appears to have sired so much misery and error. Fortunately for the social critic who is interested in these matters, there is a growing body of research and theory which can be used to supplement and inform our own experience. There is the whole mass of behavioural "reward-punishment" conditioning work. Irving Janis, as *Persimmony*, has marshalled the evidence from decades of research, which shows that a threat which arouses fear and/or anger causes an improvement in mental functioning at low levels (that is, an improvement over a state of no threat at all) but a massive *deterioration* and collapse at high levels. Milton Rokach, in *The Open and Closed Mind*, has brought together a wealth of evidence on the effects of a chronic state of threat on individuals, and even more interesting, on the extent to which large and complex institutions such as the Catholic church respond to threats to institutional viability with dogmatism, punitiveness, and authoritarianism. Walter Cannon, in *Rebilly Changes in Pain, Rage, Hunger and Fear*, has shown how some threat situations increase the physiological capabilities of the body but erode mental processes. Alexander Lowen has demonstrated in *The Betrayal of the Body* how panic depresses breathing and shuts off feeling and thought. There are a dozen other familiar books and a hundred or more lesser known research reports. And, somewhat unusually for the behavioural sciences, there is a high degree of correspondence among them. If one uses a not terribly complex model of explanation, findings on the effects of threat on the body, the mind, and society, are quite in agreement and quite consistent with what we would already suspect if we stopped to think about our personal experience. What follows is based upon this body of evidence.

□

A.A. Milne has captured the essence of what happens to a person subjected to sudden threat with his whimsical account of the confusion suffered by Pooh's friend, Piglet, when he unexpectedly stumbles upon an operation which he believes to be an elephant. "Help, help!" cried Piglet, "a Hellsump, a Horrible Hellsump!" and he scampered off as hard as he could, still crying out, "Help, help, a Horrible Hellsump! Hells. Hoff, a Hellsible Hellsump! Hells, Hoff, a Hellsible Hellsump!" And he didn't stop crying and scampering until he got to Christopher Robin's

house.

And Arthur Koestler, in his usual succinct way, tells us why it happens: "In rage and panic, the sympatho-adrenal apparatus tyrannizes the whole . . ." (*The Act of Creation*).

Despite the fact that we all know that confusion and poor functioning can follow the application of the threats, we still persist in trying to use them to control the behaviour of others. Certainly one explanation for this is the fact that in some uncomplicated situations they work very well and we know it. For example, they are great for shooting animals.

"You will never get that blasted cat to stay off the table until you scold him off!" says my wife. She is right, of course. Unfortunately such simple solutions don't work nearly as well when we are dealing with Romans or the Panthers or Richard Nixon or our children, or others of those complex members of the human species whose behaviour we would like so much to control.

To begin with, people usually don't think very well when they are being threatened. We all know this. Even so simple, cold, and efficient a threat as a highway patrol car seen in the rear view mirror will cause most motorists to commit driving errors in their anxiety to avoid trouble—a fact which at least American patrolmen, eager to boost their output of citations, know only too well. And the fact that almost everyone will meekly submit to that situation is probably due largely to the threat of the gun at the hip and the power of the law, though practically no one (and recently perhaps) really would believe on a rational level that he would be shot for breaking traffic laws or disobeying a highway patrolman.

More profound levels of threat will evoke equally more profound reactions. When the threat becomes so acute that real fear of death, painful injury or severe loss triggers what we call terror, then all the responses so familiar to our emotions and nightmares flood our organism. Intense psychological stress characterizes this level, as do major physiological changes. The mind is trapped in a desperate search for escape, the future collapses into the next moment, reasoning power gives way to automatic reactions. Psychologists call this the "premotorizing" effect of intense threat or crisis. At the physiological level, the organism is readied to fight or to flee. Adrenalin enters the system, blood sugar increases, the heart and lungs speed up and deepen their pumping, the palms and armpits perspire, the eyes dilate, the hair on the body stands on end. The terrified primate persuades the brain. Pain and rage, incidentally, share with fear the prelude for mobilizing the body while paralyzing the ordered mind.

(It is in this fact that our technical achievements as weaponry have trapped us in a most bizarre way. If we think of 'man the warrior' we come to realize how. It used to be that the warrior fought with sword,

club, axe, or on the battlefield with gun and bayonet. The crisis conditions of pain, rage and fear, which mobilized his body and dulled his logical capacities, served him well. Of such stuff were heroes made. But now, when the warrior is a technician, when his function is to fly a plane or command a nuclear submarine or analyse the flood of important data in a war room, then the response of the body to crisis betrays him. For his throbbing body has become an enemy of the cool mind and decision-making ability which are so badly needed. We are caught as brains in a web of machinery and our muscles atrophy. We have tricked ourselves, for those crisis responses which served fighting Homo Sapiens for a million years have now become the Achilles heel which may carry us all to sheer destruction.)

But at what levels of threat do such social control mechanisms as legal sanctions or nuclear deterrence fail? It is hard to be certain, for no one has studied the inner reactions people in general have to these threats. Presumably the run-of-the-mill population thinks little and cares less about such distant abstractions, and it is mainly the dissident, the would-be criminal, or the military commander who consciously feels threatened. Yet, we try to make the threats immediate. Newspaper stories and the TV news dratch us with the gore of our vengeance on Blacks, niggers, prisoners, or foreign peasants who resist. One would be inclined to conclude that everyone must respond to the level of threat in the culture set as an abstract notion but as a real fear evoking an image of potential pain.

Much the same would seem to be true of the nuclear threat overshadowing our lives despite the reassuring language of the military who prefer to talk of 'population response' instead of annihilated people or of 'floor space' instead of devastated cities. On the *Scotch, Age and Essence*, and *Dr Strangelove* vividly depict the death threat of civilization. Movies, newspaper reports, magazine articles, and scientific journals we with one another in painting the doomsday aspects of nuclear war. Scholars tell us how nearly inevitable it is. The threat is driven home to all but the most obtuse. Here though, it is not primarily the advocates of nuclear deterrence strategies who are the ardent portrayers of holocaust, but the opponents. Paradoxically then, these opponents may serve the very policies they abhor: by escalating the height of the populace they may induce the very denial, irrational thinking and subversive political mood which render impotent attempts to alter the policy.

However, despite occasional acute concern, the nuclear threat, like the fear of lung cancer for the heavy smoker or of a fatal overdose for the heroin addict, must be relegated to the mid-levels in the perceptual systems of most people. While it would certainly be the ultimate crisis, should it occur, its abstractness and perceived low probability means that

the reactions to extreme threat I mentioned earlier are mostly about. It does, however, have an equally pernicious quality which is shared with the other sources of threat mentioned above. *It is chronic.* Explosive duty by the roar and stink of military jets and the news, fuelled by our awareness of the arms race and recurrent crises, it cuts its way into our psyche and creates what psychologists call anxiety. The constant presence of anxiety has its own load of detrimental effects on cognitive and physical functioning and on social organization. Cognitively, it fosters dogmatism, denial, positiveness, defensiveness, rigidity—in short, low levels of adaptability or creativity. Physically, it leads to insomnia, anorexia, constipation, and loss of sexual drive—symptoms which in turn become the causes of new types of cognitive disability. Socially it leads to paranoia, vindictiveness and authoritarian institutions.

A state of chronic anxiety, however, need not be uniquely the result of chronic threat, as in the case of the nuclear spectre which hangs over us decade after decade. It may also be the result of a single traumatic experience. Therapists are all too familiar with bodies and psyches which have been permanently warped by a single childhood experience of terror or panic. There is evidence that soldiers stunned with shock on the battlefield still suffer anxieties almost too powerful to bear as much as 10 years later. Other research reveals that a single injection of sodium (a drug which causes paralysis and intense panic for a few seconds), when coupled with a tone, will so traumatize an individual that the sound of that tone more than a year later will cause renewed panic. Thus it is conceivable that one really had nuclear wars could raise the level of chronic anxiety permanently, especially since the constant threat is real and the reminders are constant. One is reminded of the film version of H.G. Wells' *The Time Machine*. In this story, the gentle race of humans who dwell above ground a thousand years from now march robot-like to the subterranean tunnels when the noon wails—there to be butchered and eaten by the burrowing race. Presumably they had been fully and permanently conditioned by a former nuclear war, with the conditioning handed on from generation to generation. At a less fantastic level, it is quite legitimate to conclude from the evidence that a single traumatic experience can so alter a person's (or a society's) ability to function effectively as to significantly reduce its survival potential.

As for our current generation, we think that we have learned how, if not to love the bomb, at least to live with it. Few of us seem to think much about it any more. The denial mechanism is in full bloom. But the bomb is still there, and growing yearly. Even more discouraging, with each year its control passes further out of the hands of individual human beings and deeper into the complexities of bureaucratic and technical systems. And such systems have already, I think, proven

themselves even more senseless, erratic, and destructive than individual men. We may yet be mesmerized, but increasingly the chances are that it will be not in rage and passion but in error, or as the result of a soulless logic thrust into a decision system somewhere in the vast network of specialized activity which assumes the world's weaponry. We pretend that we know so well how to organize and rule ourselves, our world and our machines, but we know almost nothing and think seriously about the consequences of cumulative decisions even less. We may well blow up our world, and if we do, anyone who is around a hundred years from now is to look back and reconstruct how it happened in almost certain to say, "Of course." Sometimes there seems a certain inevitability about it.

(One must suppose too that the bomb is pretty passive, perhaps kept around mostly for its phallic attraction. The ominous ones—the gases and bacteria and weather controls and electronic devices, must by now be far more resolved and deadly.)

We're tired, and we don't pay much attention any more. Most people couldn't tell you what an MIRV is. Why try? We feel so helpless in the face of the threat. We can't fight, so we flee. And we flee in many directions. But whenever we flee in our denial of the nuclear threat, it seems we encounter new terrors.

Thus the nuclear spectre of the '50s and '60s has been largely supplanted since 1970 by a fear of ecocide, and species suicide through revolutionary war, reproduction, run-away consumption, and social collapse. Increasingly too, and especially among the young, there is a growing fear of a malevolent 'they', an established system of dominance crushing joy and freedom with its inexorable bureaucratic logic which grinds all human potential through the mill of power and profit. Its face is the parody face of the self-righteous politician and businessman, its works are the works of violence and death, its daily symbols are the cruiser, the helmet, the club and the tear-gas canister. It is hated and despised, but more than that, it is feared—feared with the hopeless despair for the future that leads many to the blind outrage of a children's revolution and others to the blind passivity of the needle and the bottle. Fight or flight—it is a choice as ancient as life itself.

What of those situations where neither fight nor flight is possible? Such would be the case for the masses of the world. The normal man can do nothing. He must simply 'swallow his terror' and live with it. Much the same is true of even a soldier, such as the commander of a nuclear submarine. He can't really use the body his terror has prepared for battle. He must sit still, evaluate information coming over meters, and at best push a few buttons. Studies show that this kind of threat situation, where there is no possibility of acting to cope with it, has the most pernicious effects of all. Some animals simply die in such situations. Humans don't ordinarily die, they act in inappropriate ways. Some

dozens, some lash out readily at nothing, some just drop the threat, some undertake elaborate but meaningless rituals of defence (bomb shelters, for example). All of these have dangerous effects. One explanation of the hawkish bent of the American public is that this belligerence is the only possible outlet for the frustration and rage generated by the perpetual terror of the age. This would be true of the older generation at least. The young are hawks of a different feather. Their hatred is directed not so much against the Soviets or the Communists or other foreign enemies as against the Pig, the Polluter, and the President.

The agonizing reality is probably itself largely a legacy of the days of nuclear terror. It was that terror and the world-view which it fostered which set the stage for militarism at home and abroad, mistreatment of dissent, and a casual acceptance of unskilled violence for the supposed accomplishment of the most trivial or abstract of ends.

Many years ago Harold Lasswell, in his *The Garrison State*, predicted how this would happen when he told us that in a nation obsessed with fear of enemies, power would increasingly fall into the hands of specialists on violence. It is doing so now in America. While the American military patrol and pacifies the world, the local police and their national nerve centres patrol and pacify the neighbourhoods. Their budgets soar, their numbers proliferate, while adequate education, medical care, food, and a clean environment are given short shrift indeed. And to a lesser extent the same is true of most of the rest of the world.

Not everyone agrees with Lasswell. External threat is often lauded as the fuel of patriotism and national commitment. Mao is quoted as saying that if there had been no hostile America he would have had to invent one to consolidate China and rally her masses to impossible tasks. Machiavelli counselled princes to cultivate the fear of external enemies to eliminate dissent at home. It's the 'Rally round the flag' phenomenon. But this is not the whole story. External threat does cement the members of a group, but in bitter bonds. It makes them feel more dependent on one another for safety and thus less tolerant of dissent, it makes them more willing to man blindly behind a leader, it makes them cling neurotically to one another for emotional support. We have all seen this. At the same time, it is most destructive of the real human sympathy among the members of the group. Fear of the enemy dominates love for the friend. Hating the common enemy, each member secretly looks for a private escape. The 'cohesiveness' of the group, while not illusory, is pernicious rather than beneficial. Community is transformed into an oppressive collective. The enhanced 'esprit de corps', the heightened patriotism generated in the face of a common danger, are in fact and enduring only for a brief moment at the beginning. They soon turn into conformism and cheerism. Enthusiasm for the common effort is drowned up by propaganda geared to constantly

trigger the fear and then constantly re-emerge the slack and the weary. Bitterness floods people's faces and lives. Joyousness and playfulness become suspect. People are expected to smile a lot. Ashamed and afraid, they no longer look into one another's eyes and hearts. The enemy abroad has in a very true sense become the tyrannical ruler of everything human beings cherish.



I noted above that pain, rage and fear, all evoke nearly identical physiological and mental responses in the individual. Why should this be so? Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned from the organism. It is apparent that all of these stimuli prepare us to be aggressive, that is, to strike out and to try to destroy that which is hurting, angering, or threatening us. That this is so in the case of rage is well known. Rage and frustration are closely linked and a whole school of psychology has spent much of 30 years describing the relationship between frustration and aggression. At a more direct level, we all know that rage makes us uncontrollable and ready to fight. That pain and threats also tend to cause aggression or 'lashing out' is less well known, however, or perhaps it is also well known but little considered by those who base social policy on the use of threats.

Or it may be that pain and threats are transformed into rage and frustration and that this is the mechanism whereby these stimuli evoke aggression. This also makes sense. Experiments show that rats given a painful electric shock attack and bite the bars from which it is received, giving every evidence of being enraged. And threats are, almost by definition, the promise to deny something which is treasured—even physical well-being. Such denials of desired goals fit the classical definition of frustration. So it may well be that the reason pain, rage and fear all make us react in the same elemental and primitive way is that at the physiological level they all boil down to much the same thing.

But if so, think what this implies for the use of threats in negotiations such as legal systems where they are always at least in the background, in a foreign policy such as 'containment' where they are very much in the foreground, or in nuclear deterrence where they dominate everything. It means, in the simplest form, that to be subject to such threats makes people mad, and when people get mad they are notorious for damned well not doing what is being demanded. They are also prone, as I have noted, not to think very clearly and to be full of fight. Now if the target of the threats is a small child, a business associate, a student or an employee, we can usually put up with his resentment and anger. If the target is, on the other hand, an already belligerent nation with nuclear equalizers of its own, we had best stand lightly. Our efforts to contain and control it may evoke just the opposite of the desired peaceful acquies-

science, and the stakes are oblique. Does America allow itself to be 'contained' as it so blandly says it is containing China? Does America quietly acquiesce to being 'detoured' by the Soviet Union or does it desperately try to elude their pressure with ABM systems and retaliatory counter-counter-threats? There is much talk handed about in military and quasi-military academic circles that U.S. deterrence threats can make the Soviet Union grudgingly accept an 'inferior status' or 'give up'—what-ever that means. Did England give up under threats from Germany?

If we are incapable of learning from history it seems unlikely that we will be capable of learning from the behavioural sciences. Yet the evidence is abundant and clear if we would but look at it. Using threats to try to control the behaviour of another triggers off a whole constellation of responses which makes it very unlikely that we will get the behaviour desired. And even if in the short run we do, all kinds of other things happen which are almost certainly disastrous in their long-run consequences. Many deterrence theorists are aware of this and they talk little of 'long-term deterrence' and its effects on the nations involved. They know all too well that a fostered nationalism, self-righteousness, authoritarian rule, and widespread pathology on all sides. They argue rather for its usefulness in a crisis, citing the effectiveness of Khrushchev's rocket ranting over Suez in cooling the ardour of British and French in 1956, or they point to the effectiveness of Kennedy's rocket ranting over Cuba to cause the Soviets to bow and take their missiles home.

There is no question about it, you can sometimes make a man or a nation back down by threatening to beat the hell out of them if they don't do so and so—but it's a gamble. They often don't back down, and then there can be the devil to pay. When police flood a restless campus in Tokyo or Berkeley with arms, patrol cars, tear gas, helmets and clubs, the level of violence by the students doesn't dampen into youthful politeness and academic order, it escalates into rock throwing, building trashing, and defiant curses. When I was sixteen and my father laid down seven demands on my behaviour 'or else', I rebelliously and systematically ignored all his demands and the following day I left home. Few who stop to think seriously about it would question today the proposition that many of America's ill practices, much of her belligerent and aggressive nature, most of her oppressive policies, can be traced to the fact that for 40 years now she has felt severely threatened, first by the Axis powers, and then by the Soviet bloc and China and she, in turn, has become a prime threatener. The evidence is clear: *threats usually evoke the very behaviour they are designed to prevent.*

We know this, yet we so habitually ignore and deny it in our personal practices and national policies that it might illuminate our consciousness to think seriously about the mechanisms by which this occurs.

A moment ago I set down a bottle of beer on the desk beside me. Something in the way the light caught the bottle and surface of the desk, something in the sound as I set it down, made me believe that I had tilted it and it was falling over. In reflex I grabbed for the bottle, in the process hitting it with my knuckle and in fact knocking it spilling.

This is a 'self-fulfilling prophecy' built into the organism. A cue sets off a response in us. We react. The reaction creates the very condition we initially anticipated.

Such has been the situation of hatred and distrust between the major nations of the world, such is a more general sense is the nature of nearly all human interactions. Our beliefs about the world, our responses to what we think it is like, create that world in their image.

Our lives are sets of expectations born of our past experiences. From those expectations spring a new reality. We move in the world around us and we predict what we will find—sometimes warily testing, sometimes with full surety that there will be love—or anger—or hatred—or trust. We predict and so we act. Our actions breed the reality. To illustrate -

A mother, frustrated and furious with an obnoxious child, can find threat in a refuge from having to deal with the situation in a way which fully engages her emotions and other reactions. She will say, 'All right, that's it. If you do that one more time I am going to spank you. This is the third night this week you've said you were hungry and wanted to eat, then disappeared by the time I had supper ready. If you ever do that again I'm going to just stop fixing you food.' The child responds sullenly, and the event is over. It has been 'handled'. Now attention can be turned to something else. In reality, of course, the situation has not been solved at all—a has merely been postponed, tossed into another time for disposal. How much better it would be, it seems to me, if the mother could find a way to react in that moment with the fullness of her feelings of that moment—the anger, the betrayal, the feeling of being scorned and unloved, to respond to the child directly with those feelings instead of trying to shunt the problem off to another time with the mechanism of threat. And of course in the act of postponing the full reaction, she creates a situation in which, when it does happen again she has been made a victim of her previous threat—even though this time the situation may be a little different or her mood a lot different, and she isn't really very angry. Now she is trapped. Now she must either carry out the punishment which she doesn't feel at all like administering or she will no longer be believed by the child. Her statements and emotions won't be taken seriously and the relationship will deteriorate. Determinate theorists have written reams and politicians have spoken volumes about how this same mechanism works at the international level. They call it 'maintaining credibility'. Bargaining theory formalizes it into complex

mathematical formulae. I call it self-entrapment. Our actions breed the reality.

Yet, we know something of how the interaction between two parties in a threat relationship causes the threat and fear level to escalate. But fear tends to escalate internally also. That is, an initial threat one seems to set off a low level of fear. Under some conditions, that fear will increase over time rather than decrease even in the absence of reinforcing cues. We would not expect this to be so, given our ordinary view that the effects of a stimulus decrease with the passage of time. So to understand why it is so we need to look at some psychological evidence which is well established but little used in most models of behaviour. It is this: *When an event is feared, preparations to cope with the event increase the conviction that it will indeed occur.* The greater the preparations, the greater the conviction. There are a number of carefully controlled studies which confirm this, but evidence is more readily at hand if we will but tap into what we all know upon reflection. The home-owner who worries about burglars and buys a bedside gun will thereafter worry more. If he moves into a 'hardened community', purchases a guard dog, a gun, extra locks, alarms, and hires a patrol service, his worry will turn into absolute conviction that robbers prow! everywhere. The police, who are prepared for crime with elaborate organisation and equipment, see its potential in every passing face. Similarly, a patient who watches cancer preparations for emergency as he enters the operating room will be more convinced that one is likely to occur. Occupation troops who make intricate plans for dealing with possible disturbances soon find themselves thinking in terms of certain riot and revolution. By the same token, the more of our national treasure and energy we spend to deal with internal disturbances or with possible nuclear attack (ABM, etc.) the more convinced we become that attack will take place. This is known to psychologists as a *spiral mechanism*.

It should now be clear that fear will tend to escalate as preparations are made to deal with it. What may have begun as a small, vague and uncertain threat one is transformed into a massive bogey as we try to master our resources to cope with it. At the individual level, this seems to be because we want to justify to ourselves our defensive sacrifices and the way to do this is to assure ourselves that they are really necessary. As we successfully do this then, fear increases with our increased certainty as to the reality and the magnitude of the threat. At the national level, a parallel process takes place, with the assurances of the reality of the threat taking the form, for instance, of military testimony before Congress or of Pentagon propaganda as to the severity of the threat being used to justify a new weapons system. And of course once the multi-billion dollar system has been created, then we've got to believe in the reality of the threat, else we've squandered all that work and money.

which could have been used for other things. The same thing happens when we've created the lives of our sons in a war. The enemy must be evil and the cause just. To believe otherwise is intolerable.

(It is the same psychological trap which allows psychiatrists, medical doctors, drug companies, and even liquor and perfume manufacturers to charge exorbitant fees with impunity. They know that people will be certain that something *that expensive* must be more valuable than if it were cheaper.)

The result of this mechanism? That which began as a possibility is now translated into a fearful certainty in our minds. Thus, of course, is the classic definition of paranoia.

Conclusion

Not all animals respond to threats in the same way. Each reacts to threat according to his kind. The snake hisses or slinks silently off, the gazelle stampedes, the turtle shrinks into his armour, the bird takes flight. For each, evolutionary experience has added a typical fighting or fleeing motor response to the automatic physiological and mental changes triggered by threat. That is, not only does the body change instantaneously, but certain behaviour sequences seem to be activated in a way nearly as automatic. Whether these will be predominantly of the hiding, fleeing or fighting nature depends on the animal and upon the threat cut. For man, with his spectral heritage of fleeing safety in caves, behind fire and cliffs, and in the mutual aid of organized numbers, the behavioural sequence triggered by threats seems to be to retreat into fortifications, to find defensive weapons, and to submerge himself into the group. An overlay of changing culture on this unchanging animal gave us the walled cities of the early agricultural era, the feudal castles of the middle ages, the armed and disciplined nation and guarded communities of today. It explains our obsession with 'nuclear shields', 'hardened' weapons and homes, and consensus and patriotism. Each is the modern manifestation of a most primitive instinct. The 'increase in group cohesion as a function of external threat' so elaborately described and tested by contemporary social psychologists reflects nothing more than the response of half-sentient primates meaning to join their fellows in the case when danger is sensed or the reflexes of the seaf who dropped his bee and shouted his warning and babies to the cattle when a dust cloud announced bandits.

But we human animals are not always such defensive creatures. Sometimes we become aggressors, we 'go on the warpath' and search out others to plunder. This is not odd. Most animals will be both defensive and aggressive on occasions. And when we have been the aggressor, we have always known that the reaction of our victim will be to fortify themselves, organize and fight back. Until recently at least.

Now significant action in the world seem to have forgotten this. For the assumptions of 'confrontation politics', 'law and order', 'containment', and 'deterrence' are—and this is wildly at variance with all we know about human behaviour—that when we confront, dominate, and threaten another group, they will meekly submit and change their ways to suit us.

Or do we really not believe this at all and merely hide behind the assertion as a smoke-screen covering the fact that our demands for more cops and guns, more fantastic military machinery, show that we are enamoured of weaponry, that what we really dream of doing is not controlling but destroying all those who dare to resist our will? Perhaps this is so. Perhaps all the rant about control and deterrence is nothing but an attempt to hide the fact that we are all—Parthar, Pig and Preacher alike—entangled in a culture which has become pervaded with violence, destruction and death. Perhaps all the arguments are spurious, even to those who make them. Perhaps our glorious day as the gun as Homo Sapiens—the animal which reasons—is drawing to a close and we are beginning a lonesome march to the sea of our own bloody passions.

The apologist will argue that confrontation politics, law and order, containment or nuclear deterrence are not aggressive actions. This is nonsense. Each is an attempt by one group to bend another existing group to its will, whether the other wishes or not. The English language has always had a word for this. It is conquest. The ideological, legal and moral justifications are elaborate, loud, self-righteous, assuasive, contradictory and always self-serving. We have heard them for centuries and for centuries have known that they are just that—justifications. It is conquest. When shotgun armed Partiers take over a hall it is conquest. When three or four helmeted cops club a student into unconsciousness, it is conquest. When the United States incinerates a million Vietnamese from the air it is conquest. When the President delivers an ultimatum backed up by nuclear missiles it is conquest. It is not liberation or law and order or pacification or democracy. It is naked and brutal threat and violence and it is older than the species. But what may have worked to preserve the bare lives of simple primitives will not work to preserve the fabric of a complex society. Our threats and our violence are clothed in tear gas, fragmentation bombs and nuclear fire. Violence has become the handmaiden of extermination—not just for individuals, but for the species. Our threat society seems to have brought us to a dead end.

'Is your journey necessary?'

ROGER FRANKLIN

Nobody is enriched by mechanized mobility. All our beloved cars, planes, ships, trucks, buses, moon-rockets and missiles, and even that environmentalist's pet, the railroads, are a danger to mankind, to all living things, and to the good earth itself. Unless we can cut these monsters of movement down to size, down to the non-polluting bicycle, sailing ship and canal barge, we are heading for doom, either by pollution, or by the exhaustion of resources.

Industrial man consumes and pollutes 25 to 50 times as fast as a simple peasant while crying alarm at the impossibility of feeding the hungry poor. Yet what people really need as food, clothing and shelter can vary by no more than a factor of two or three. All the excess consumption and pollution must derive from industrialization, from the use of powered machinery. This automatically makes a case for a neo-Luddite movement demanding control of the ravages of machinery. How much powered machinery can we consume to use if we are to preserve the environment for our children and their children?

If a third of the world's people are consuming, per capita, roughly 25 times the resources that the other two-thirds use to barely subsist, then the resources available, if properly distributed, could be giving a life of sufficiency—if not of luxury and waste—to everyone now living, and to those billions more who must come before we are able to defuse the population bomb.

"But there is a distribution problem, and yet you call for the stopping of mechanized transport?"

A distribution problem indeed there is, because what do we find all that transport burning up all that oil to move? When it is not rushing people around on all sorts of perverse and frivolous reasons, then it is sucking raw materials out of poor nations into rich nations, or hauling food from a degraded, mechanized countryside, where people might be

living and producing for local use, into the urban sprawls. (While those who cannot bear to remain too long in the polluted cities become commuters and add even more superfluous travel.)

Stop the transport, stop the rush-around mania, and what would happen? Hungry people would have to begin to move back to the countryside, to the source of food. And the land would start to be used properly again, with food grown intensively by people who would learn to get off their backides and harness the natural processes which, with adequate labour, can grow phenomenal quantities of food per acre without polluting chemicals and pesticides. This can be done and is being done in a few places, but it means work on essentials not frills, it means giving up dependence on a few primary producers and their polluting machinery who now operate so inefficiently (in terms of land use) and at such a high cost to the environment.

Properly organized, the work of local production for local use need not be arduous, and can certainly be more satisfying for all workers than the machine-minding routines now endured by so many.

Each car in the USA costs the average owner about \$1,500 annually to run, maintain and replace. Thus 160 million cars must be consuming \$150 billion worth of materials and services, or about a sixth of the disastrous "Gross National Cost". This is more than is spent on the whole of the US food industry, which is itself grossly inflated in cost by excessive transporting, packaging, advertising, and the rest. If one adds in the aeroplanes (about four times the fuel per passenger mile of a full car) and 500 million passenger-miles of domestic flights every day, the trains, buses, and ships, the tankers hauling oil, the subsidies to roads, railways and airlines, as well as the cost of military mobility, it seems clear that more than half the *fringe* of activity in the USA—and the picture is similar in most industrial countries—can be attributed to mechanical mobility.¹

Clearly, the actual value of any commodity remains unchanged when it is moved (unless it is reduced by damage in transit). So the need for all those ships, planes, trains and trucks (and for the packaging industry) arises only because raw materials have to be moved from where they occur to where we have decided to process them, and from there to where consumers have decided to live. The huge network of transportation has, of course, led to a remarkable degree of concentration and specialization in production, and to the ever-increasing use of machinery to replace muscle. It has helped in the production of a wide range of *artifacts*, but hardly essential "goods", so that those who are rich enough can purchase exotic products from the ends of the earth. Which might be well and good if we could afford it. But in ecological terms, and in view of the large majority of mankind who remain impoverished in the midst of this conspicuous consumption, we clearly

canon

It is instructive to inquire how much of the elaborate industrial machine that the transport system serves is, in fact, incessantly parsable: how many resources, how many vehicles, are used in just making and maintaining the transport system itself? In an article on 'Transportation' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1968), Prof. Robert E. Carlson writes 'From the advent of the industrial revolution in the western world, the trend was towards centralization and concentration of large-scale industries in certain locations. Specialists, producing only parts of the finished product, worked in scientifically managed plants often far removed from one another, with highways, railroads and waterways used to carry these products to centres where they were assembled. Hence, while Detroit, Mich., is recognized as the world's automobile capital, its preeminence is due in great measure to the US transportation system. Rubber products from Akron, O., electrical equipment from the East Coast, steel from Pittsburgh, Pa., and motors assembled in automated plants in Buffalo, NY, are shipped to Detroit.'

Compare this with the preceding passage in the same article: 'Prior to the Industrial Revolution, producers of goods (such as the blacksmith, cabinet-maker and leather worker) . . . drew necessary raw materials from the near vicinity, converted the raw materials into a finished product in their own shop, and sold the commodity to a nearby market. This forced each producer to be a general craftsman rather than a specialist; it limited the things he could make to readily available raw materials; it encouraged decentralization of industries into small-scale units. While this sometimes resulted in an infinite variety of beautiful, individualized products, it could hardly be called efficient.'

The overgrowth of canan did not begin with the automobile and truck, but started when the railroads and steamships made possible a supply of food and raw material (and labour) from an ever-expanding countryside—and ultimately from the ends of the earth. As Professor Carlson says, the process of machines feeding machines began quite early: 'Because newly industrialized nations had to feed substantial supplies of raw materials overseas to satisfy the insatiable appetite of the machine, fleets of ships having large capacities and fast speeds were required.'

So the whole grotesque 'megamachine', with its horrible alarm, its repetitive, mechanical work for millions, its threat to the environment, and its rush to automated annihilation as the 'megamachines' conflict, was made possible by the invention of ever faster and 'cheaper' means of transport—cheap in terms of human labour, which is all that has to be paid for in the short run, but terribly costly in terms of using up so many irreplaceable resources, and in making us entirely dependent on this high rate of use.

We are so immersed in an economic system designed for the benefit of the processors and salesmen that, provided customers can be found to pay the price, any increase in cost of production that results from an excessive use of machinery or of transportation is regarded as a contribution to the national wealth, and is tacked up as part of that shibboleth, the Gross National 'Product'.

This whole system has been allowed to develop because we sold out long ago to the traders and merchants and entrepreneurs. These 'middle men', who gained vast profits and power from imperialism set the pattern by which we now live, where 75 to 90 per cent of the price of most commodities used by most people is siphoned off by middle-men who move, package, store or sell the goods. This leaves a mere fraction for the primary producers, whether these are nearby farmers or far distant peons in banana, coffee and cocoa plantations overseas.

Clearly, we have scaled out industrial societies so that we are utterly dependent on mechanical transport. The majority live too far from work to walk or cycle. Many have moved from place to place so often that they would be cut off from friends and relatives without the use of cars, trains, buses and planes. Worse than this, our whole production system, as we have seen, has been geared to centralized mass production, with raw materials transported from great distances and the products re-distributed out again to huge market areas.

A sudden change, as every transport strike has shown, would produce chaos. But it is time at least to change direction. Resistance has begun already against the ultimate in rush-around madness, against airport noise, motorways, and against the SST (Concorde and ilk), which consume enormous quantities of fuel and produce localizable pollution effects. But now the time has come to revive the general slogan, used when rationality was enforced by war: 'Is your journey necessary?'

Those who are ecologically concerned should begin to minimize their own transport needs to seek work, entertainment and relaxation nearer home, to cultivate local friends, to try to improve the local environment so that mobile 'escape' becomes less necessary. Planners should include a maximum of travel in their designs for new living and working environments. But the real key is industry, the production processes themselves. By forms of preferential taxation it might be possible to 'penetrate' the worst ecological offenders—the users and makers of cars and planes—as is to force a rise in price that would begin to reflect the true ecological costs, the long-run costs, of our obsession for rushing around.

But if we are to move away from our present cult of speed and growth towards a new era of stability and more local living, we need more than government fiat. It will be a matter of gradual persuasion,

and increasing awareness. This will be helped by the increasing over-exploitation of the physical limits of the environment on our present extravagant and wasteful life cycle. Rising prices are not just a matter of mismanaged money, they reflect a real increase in costs, not only of formerly exploited labour, but of raw materials. In particular, fuel costs will continue to rise as convenient sources are used up. This increase will be reflected in the prices of all manufactured and transported products, including food. As prices rise, people will find it worth while to grow more of their own food, they will find the car and plane, and also trains and buses, too costly for frequent journeys, and they will use them less, and perhaps walk more, or bicycle, increasingly confining the greater part of their living to a small local area.

Much will depend on people's attitudes, and on how widely it is realised that we have, for the past half century, been living on ecological capital well beyond our sustained income. A battle for the environment, fought for the rights of our descendants, could yet become a new 'moral equivalent of war' (Indeed the wartime British slogan, such as 'Dig for Victory', apply as much in the fight for the environment as they did in the war.)

We don't have to stop everything, to go back to primitive, pioneer living without any scientifically developed amenities. But if we continue much longer without putting on the brakes, the system is going to collapse in chaos, and many will find they have no choice. But a plan-and-cut-back could work out differently.

In deciding what to retain and what to restrict, we must keep in mind the limits of sustained resources of energy, and of recycled materials. Sustained energy sources, such as hydro-electric, tidal, wind power, geo-thermal and the burning of wood, supply only about 5 per cent of our present energy, with further development possible on a limited scale. While solar energy for other than space heating remains but a hope, it seems reasonable, initially, to aim at supplementing the sustained resources with fossil fuels and possibly nuclear fuels (if the waste disposal is not too dangerous), to allow a total of about 20 per cent of the present rate of energy use that now takes place in industrialised nations. The use of other exhaustible resources might be cut back similarly, and full re-cycling undertaken for metals, glass, plastics and, via composting, all organic wastes.

What could be done with one-fifth of the power and resources we now use? It would be adequate for domestic lighting, cooking and economical heating, for refrigeration, postal communication and all forms of electric communications, and for the manufacture of simple, high quality, muscle-powered tools and machines (e.g. bicycles, sewing machines, looms). It would not run to extensive street lighting, space heating, air conditioning, mechanised agriculture and, in particular, to an excess of

mechanized mobility

Why do we so love to go fast? When we rush in a car, train or plane, we are passing by thousands of fascinating scenes too quickly for our senses to appreciate them. We can see more in walking a couple of miles than in flying a couple of thousand. What, then, is the lure of distant places? Once, when it was a courageous and arduous undertaking to reach them, and hence there was less cultural imperialism to wipe out differences, there was something exotic to discover. But for the tourist herds of today, the 'exotic' is ever more artificial, and a 'home away from home' seems the chief object of travel, made from climatic change.

There can be no objection to muscle-powered travel—walking, cycling—or to sailing ships, and these are capable of taking us anywhere we want to go, often less frequently than many of us have been accustomed of late. But because these ecologically sound means of travel would take longer, travel would again be more purposeful and interesting.

Speed itself has a well-known fascination. There is a component of primitive survival in speed too—the fastest predators get fed, the fastest prey escape. The same principle carries over into the sophisticated primitivism of mechanized warfare. But when, for no real purpose, these instincts are indulged beyond the physical projects of muscle-powered sports is the extravagant mechanized mobility of the highways and skyways of today, we have surely moved into a phase of gross perversion of our natural drives.

A life without 'speed' would not need to be dull. In fact, once we adjust to living more locally, we might develop a far finer culture than has arisen since the small city states of ancient Greece, and, later, those of the Renaissance.

We might reflect, as we cut back on our travel, on the actual limits of human association—the number of human contacts that can be made and maintained in the course of a lifetime. The fact that this can be measured in hundreds or thousands, rather than millions, should help remove any illusions of 'making something' that we might tend to feel when we can too easily make a number of random acquaintances in remote corners of the planet.

Finally, what of those hungry millions in poor countries? Does a transport cut-back mean they are to be sent no more aid? A careful look at what actually comes from and goes to these poor countries should quickly disillusion a realistic observer about the benefits of present trade and aid arrangements. The poor countries would be much better off if left to themselves, with nothing but technical suggestions proffered by well-wishers from the more 'advanced' areas of the world. Indeed, it was recently shown² that farmers in the mountains of New Guinea, by using an agricultural system that suits the local ecology,

are able to support as many people in adequate comfort on each square mile as can be supported by an advanced industrial economy. The difference is that, while our industrial, extractive economy may well devour its own base in less than a century, the people of New Guinea have an economy that can be sustained indefinitely. We may not have as much to teach such people as we sometimes like to believe.

Ivan Illich has frequently urged¹ that real development in Latin America be promoted by the firm imposition of a speed limit of eight to ten miles per hour on all mechanical vehicles. He points out that, in countries where fast vehicles are in daily use, 'the time people are obligated to spend travelling increases as the speed increases'. So we can save time by going slowly, and what is more important, we can save the global environment. Slowing down can also help the poorer peoples of the world because it would get the rich off their backs and so allow them to begin to provide properly for themselves in their own way, using their own resources and initiative.

□ *Quoting From Nine*, London.

1. Cf. *Scientific American*, September 1970. The article by Earl Cook on 'The Flow of Energy in an Industrial Society' assigns 30 per cent of energy use directly to transportation. The manufacture of vehicles must comprise a considerable part of another 15 per cent assigned to 'industry', and there is surely an ingredient of transportation in the 30 per cent attributed to 'household and commercial'.

2. By Roy A. Rappaport in *Scientific American*, September 1971.

3. E.g. in his speech at the conference of the Tróilund Centre for the Future of Man, London, 21 October 1971.

A poetic celebration of the Mahatma's martyrdom

L. JEEUDASAN

THE 'MARTYRDOM OF GANDHI' by Cecília Marder is a masterpiece of modern poetry. Originally written in Portuguese by the Brazilian poet, it was translated into French by T.S. Eliot. The very fact that an author of Eliot's eminence undertook a rendering of the poem is, not to mention the subject matter, a tribute to the greatness of the work. It would seem that the qualities which attracted Eliot to the poem and which continue to attract the reader to it coincide. Let us try and elucidate them from an analysis of the poem itself.

The poem is sparked off by Brazilian newspaper reports of the death and funeral of Mahatma Gandhi. As the word unfolds the leaves of newspapers the poet reads in every corner the headline 'Murdered while blessing the people'. The news, as it were, burns into her poetic soul and produces the ashes and embers of this poem. 'Here the blue screens stop and also the winged horses. Here I renounce the gay flowers of my inner dream.'

Though it is thus an elegiac dirge in kind, yet as a modern poem and despite its classical restraint, it does not use the classical Miltonic line and order. Rather it rambles with the mind of the mourner, like the dirges one hears in a country-side funeral house of Tamil Nadu. It sheds off the classical impersonality and comes alive with all the personal warmth of someone on glowing embers. It strays into the past and the future. It falls into glorious reminiscences and frightful futuristic visions. The first reminiscence is of the yester-night, January 30, when, 'In the vast night I heard a sad cry, a pained voice bee-like. And waking up I searched for a place far away and unattainable. It was you, then, who sighed so freely in the little final blood? It was your distant bones, craved through by death, sounding like delicate bamboo at the steeping down of day? Les ossements sont des brutes, madame.' Gandhi's spiritual strength and saintly power, figured by the delicate bamboo, is

confronted with the brute force of the rest of mankind that killed him. Thus a contrast is created between 'man' and 'savants'

When she reads the papers on the 31st evening, the news reports carry her from a private and possibly inferior incident to public history, namely, the glorious days of the freedom struggle marked by the restless spirit and boycott of foreign goods (symbolically ascribed in the spinning wheel) and nonviolent resistance and prohibition peacefully symbolized by the tea of Dargajing.

The contrast of the glorious past with the mournful present evokes an apostrophe to the 'dark untouchables of the whole earth' who do not even know that they should cry. Very resonant words, allusion of Gandhi's own to Tagore in the Gandhi-Tagore controversy of the 'twenties, but enlarging upon them to embrace the dark untouchables not only of India, but of the whole earth: "You, Tagore, you sing as birds who are fed in the morning. But there are hungry birds that have no voice."

From the morning when the untouchable birds do not sing, the poet becomes self-conscious of her own time of the day. It is the time when the Brazilian evening newspapers of 31 January 1948 spread the headlines of the murder which people read with an astonished discovery of their own share in the sin and guilt. 'And the most blind of all carries a torch between his soul and his sight.' The sensitive reader should be able to detect in this fourth stanza an echo of the event on Calvary as found in Luke 23:48.

It is about five in the evening in Brazil—tea time. And having read the gruesome story, all (and they are thousands) at their tea cups (it is Dargajing-Indian tea) are asking the same questions about Gandhi: 'What did this man want? Why did this man come into the world?' Surely there was a great and almost final destiny and sense of purpose about him and his life. The answer is given in Gandhi's own words. "I am no more than the little earthen bowl fashioned by the Divine Potter. When he does not need me any more, He shall let me fall."

Then comes the poet's own personal comment and it is an apostrophe to the now dead Gandhi, who is very much alive to her. 'He has let you fall. Abruptly, abruptly.' The remaining three lines of this sixth stanza, with their veiled allusion to the bullet pierced side and the last drops of blood coming forth stand that last deathless utterance, 'He Rama' (O God) and adorning his shrouding shawl, complete and deepen the parallel between the scenes of Calvary and the town of Birla House.

While the poet goes on with her mournful meditation, the wind—it is cold—which blows from India Brandwards continues to carry the message of the gruesome deed, even as it fans the headlines into the horrified eyes of every Brazilian. That message is that of Gandhi's

whole life: the supremacy of love or nonviolence. Ahim, who has heeded his words? But all have their smoking guns in their pockets! Smoking, that is, after foolishly shooting at Gandhi: their violence is still fresh in their secret consciences. Gandhi alone is free from violence (guns) and from secret possessiveness (pockets)—the possessiveness or possession of violence. His very blood was nonviolent (unarmed to the veins) and will ever be free from violence, being now fixed (by death) in its nonviolence.

The wind (played upon here in the double sense of 'prana', as both life and the air which sustains life) absorbs the whole of Gandhi's life, which is the best part in the poet's own life. In this state of absorption with the universal life-principle there is no more nationality and national symbols and military uniforms. It is a state of peace. The body of Gandhi is set on the funeral pyre which the sighs of India's women set ablaze. And the waters of the Ganges will religiously kiss the ashes which then the sun will take from the Ganges into the very presence of God. The very material ashes are not lost before God. They are present with him, even the little goat, which perhaps causes tender memories in Gandhi when he speaks to God. Thus even God is appeased, with those tender memories and materials before him. Superficially speaking, the poet does not answer the question 'What will Gandhi tell God?' But her mind is clear. Gandhi speaks as an intercessor (for men) with God. The goat itself being taken as the poetic symbol for Gandhi before God, comparable to the lamb of the evangelist St John, the parallel to the Christian, whom despots flatter. The poet has hinted what Gandhi will say to God. What will be God's answer to Gandhi? The question is not answered until we come to the end of the poem.

Meanwhile the wind continues to blow the pages and headlines of the newspaper. The headlines next to the murder of Gandhi are about the Carnival (ao Rio de Janeiro and other places). As she reads them, she hears underneath the voices of lust and anger and the howling of the crowds echoing through all the male current flows of the city. The noise, lust and impurity contrast sharply with the quiet holiness of the *ashrams'* death who bless their murderers even as they bleed. But may always tell the 'voice of concord'—those who are themselves the words of reconciliation. Thus they have also killed the last of them all—Gandhi—and returned it 'to the silence of the sky'. That is to say, they make God silent towards them. They silence him by turning a deaf ear to him.

In such a world—a world as unsteady as clouds and hopelessly violent where, poetically, the flowers of her trees are falling—the poet must feel frustrated and lonely as in a desert and must make a last appeal to even to come to the help of Gandhi in his lonely struggle.

The impassioned appeal returns the poet upon herself. The poem

is throughout a conscious act and the poet at this point becomes fully self-conscious of all that passes through her and as it were creates the poem—namely, a fellow-being with Gandhi which makes her expiate for herself the beauty and heroism of a surrender like his and makes her heart bleed to know that Gandhi's blood is spilled.

The 'word', however, takes everyone to where he belongs—to his own home, his heritage, crimes, cowardice, surprise, indifference and ridicule which are the diverse responses of men to Gandhi's life and death. As it keeps company with every reader, the word will also carry the ashes of saints who are the living flames of a dead humanity. With their passing away, darkness will cover the earth (note allusion to Matthew 27:45, Mark 15:33 and Luke 23:44) losing lose the forms of violence and consequent sorrow which Gandhi had checked, 'containing its dykes of peace'.

At long last comes the answer to the question 'What will God say to Gandhi?' God who has done enough with Gandhi, will tell him, echoing Gandhi's own words to the poet, 'Men are brutes, my son'. So he will abandon them to their own devices, to the cycle of births and deaths and the four ages, so that the original chaos of Kali Yuga, the dark age, may return. 'It is necessary to go back to the beginning', so that, repeating of this 'frenzied battle of eons', men may call for God and Gandhi and return to them. Until such times, God will close his eyes to men and their deeds. And the reason why he willed that Gandhi should be broken with violence is that 'there is no more mankind to have you at its service'—that is to say, that mankind may realize that it has turned brute and is mankind no more. It is these words of God that the wind is scattering in every direction of the globe, 'in the thousand tongues of fire', when it sprinkles the ashes of Gandhi's bones like so many roses.

The final stanza, with its migration of the Hindu and Christian theologues of history (which itself penetratingly into martyrdom) is not as dark, gloomy and desperate in its prospects for history as it perhaps seems at first sight. For there is the hint of the hope that presently through the death reflected on the martyr, mankind will realize its brutish condition of violence and will be converted to God, to Gandhi and to love (*ahimsa*). One might even read a Hindu theology into God's invocation of Gandhi in the poem as 'My son'. But personally it is more fruitful to note that God's paradoxical words to Gandhi in the final stanza are the same as those that the poet hears from Gandhi's 'pained voice bird-like' in the first. Not only does this serve as an artistic literary device in the poem, but this device also implicitly affirms that the words of a satyagrahi (man of truth) are the very words of God.

We have analysed the poem. The analysis may explain why a poet of Eliot's calibre undertook a translation of Cedric Belfrage's work. Still

it may be necessary synthetically to restate the intrinsic literary worth of the poem which accounts for the translation.

Martyrdom of Gandhi is a modern imagist-symbolist poem where every image is a symbol, striking in the vividness of image and emotion, and moving by subtle associations and strong contrasts. As is evident from the direct and oblique quotations from Gandhi, the poet displays not mere emotive sympathy with him but intelligent familiarity with his life and works, as well as with Hindu life and lore. Thus there emerges from the fourteen or fifteen stanzas of the poem the soul of Gandhi as well as of the poet. The native device of the wind fuses fact and philosophy together, namely, the Christ-event and the Gandhi-event as specifically the same event of martyrdom, which is a reflection on the historic state and evolution of the martyr on the one hand, and on the historic regression of mankind on the other; namely, men becoming brutes. As the vehicle of a synthetic, Hindu-Christian philosophy, the poem is truly a creative work. At the same time, the factual device of the newspaper which the poet is reading keeps the philosophic ramifications down-to-earth and pertinent to the facts she is reading about. Finally, the poem itself is one of the 'thousand tongues of fire' in which the Pentecostal wind is scattering the paradoxical and challenging words of God: 'Men are brutes, my son'—words which register the poet's own shock at the news of Gandhi's death-words and which ought to shock the reader too out of his complacency about his own and the general human condition.

□ Text of poem omitted

Martyrdom of Gandhiji

CECILIA MIRELBA

Here the blue clouds stop and also the winged horses
Here I remember the gay flowers of my inner dream.
The newspapers are here unfolded in the wind, at every corner.
"Murdered while blessing the people"

In the vast night I heard a sad cry, a pained voice bird-like.
And waking up I searched for a place far away and unattainable
It was you, then, who sighed so frailly, in the little final blood?
It was your distant home, crossed through by death,
Sounding like delicate bamboos at the stooping down of day?
'Les hommes sont des brutes, madame.'

O days of resistance, the spinning-wheel weaving in every home,
O Vande Mataram, in the small harmonium, among slices of gold.
The tea of Darjeeling, milady, has the flavour of white roses.
Streets, streets, streets, do you know who was killed there yonder on the
other side of the world?

Dark unreachables of the whole earth! You do not even know that you
should cry!

'You, Tagore, you sing as birds who are fed in the morning
But there are hungry birds that have no voice.'

And the evening wind fans the better headlines. Men read
They read with the eyes of children spelling fables. And walk along
And we all walk along! And the most blind of all carries a torch
between his soul and his sight.

Here too it is five o'clock. And I see your name among thousands of cups.

In the short smoke of the tea that nobody drinks.
 'What did this man want?' 'Why did this man come into the world?'
 —'I am no more than the little earthen bowl fashioned by the Divine Potter
 When He does not need me any more, He shall let me fall.'

He has let you fall. Abruptly, abruptly
 There still remained inside a draught of blood
 Your heart was not yet dry, hallowed phantoms,
 Small cups over-blown in a sheet of foam, among sacred words

The evening wind comes and goes between India and Brazil, and is not
 used
 Above all, my brothers, non-violence
 But all have their smoking guns in their pockets.
 And you were, in truth, the only one without guns, without pockets,
 without tea,
 Unarmed to the veins, free from yesterday and the day of tomorrow.
 'Les hommes sont des frères, madame'

The wind takes away your whole life, and the best part of mine,
 Without flags, without uniforms. Nothing but soul, in a crumbled
 world
 The women of India are bowed like bundles of agita
 Your part is ablate. The Ganga will take you far away,
 Mindful of dust which the waters will closely keep.
 And she will take up from the waters, up to the infinite hands of God
 'Les hommes sont des frères, madame'
 What will you say to God, of the men that you have met?
 A little goat, perhaps, will awake tender souvenirs

The wind blows the headlines, makes news about, men dance.
 It is Carnival-time here now. (And everywhere.)
 The voices of madams and the voices of lust stretch out vigorous bows.
 The howling of the crowds echoes through the thousand levels of cement.

Saints die solemnly, blessing their murderers.
 The last voice of deserted returns to the silence of the sky
 The flowers of my toes are falling. I see a loneliness come to embrace
 me
 Clouds arrive, clouds, like burned symbols
 The wind gathers the clouds, pushes troops of elephants
 Fly, peoples, help the frail man who loved you!

Along my arms descends a surrender of beauty and browns.
What currents were there between your heart and mine
That my blood should suffer to know that yours is spilled?

The wind takes the men through the streets of their business, of their
crimes.
It takes the surprise, the curiosity, the indifference, the laughter.
It pushes everyone to his own home, and continues on its crusade.

The wind will blow quick flames, the wind will take light ashes.
Afterwards there will be darkness And there will be much sorrow. At
last those tears will flow,
Those tears that you were holding back, containing in dykes of peace.

God will say to you 'Men are known, my son.
We have tested enough. Let us turn them loose, so that they return to
class, so that the ocean may boil.
So that they may go and return, and again go and return
Come and see from these my palaces of bliss the furious battle of
errors
It is necessary to go back to the beginning. I shall also close my eyes
And that is why I ordered that you should be broken with violence
There is no more mankind to have you at its service
Breathe with me your last breath Until such times when we may open
our eyes again,
When men will call for us'

The wind is scattering the words of God in the thousand tongues of fire
In the thousand roses of ashes of your old bones, Mahatma.

□ First published in India in *United India*, May-June 1948, and reproduced here with permission

Approaches to nonviolent revolution

ROD OVERY

THERE ARE TWO RADICALLY DIFFERENT WAYS of looking at 'nonviolent revolution' and several different positions which might be accommodated under the label. It is a great big rag-bag of a concept. As a goal it sounds right and as a slogan it has flair. The danger, I fear, is that we'll begin to speak and act as if nonviolent revolution is the agreed pacifist goal, without being aware that we may be talking about different things and with some of us still not convinced that nonviolent revolution is a practical objective.

In a recent review article in *Peace News*, the nonviolent revolutionary was told, on the one hand jokingly, to be 'too busy making the revolution' to read a book. On the other hand, he was said to have the serious problem of formulating and implementing a coherent strategy of revolution.

Now a man who has not yet formulated a strategy cannot be busy implementing it. So I assume the person who is busy 'making the non-violent revolution' has no need of a strategy. Presumably he feels emotionally and morally that there must be a revolution and believes it must be made without violence because violence is wrong and seems always to betray its advocates. His would be a personal or subjective view of non-violent revolution.

The other view, that there is a serious problem to be faced in formulating and implementing a nonviolent revolution, suggests that a non-violent revolution may be a possible historical event if those who wish to see it will learn what are the conditions in which it could occur and then will act to make it happen. This view could have no built-in certainty, though it would probably be based on the faith that change can be made without violence. It is a more political view than the first, but could not be called an objective view of revolution until it could describe a politics of how the revolution will be made.

If we look at possible views of nonviolent revolution which could be developed from a personal ethical standpoint, I can distinguish three: the traditional pacifist, the Tolstoyan and the drop-out. In addition, there are three further views which are more political but which I would also classify as personal.

PACTISM The traditional pacifist view holds as its lowest common denominator that 'war will cease when men refuse to fight'. This could be called a revolutionary position because if everybody did renounce war then there would have to be a revolutionary transformation in our societies. The methods of pacifist persuasion—by means of conscientious objection, tax refusal, by the example of personal living and by other propaganda—have set war resisters firmly in the tradition of destruction against the state. The power of the pacifist's *hierarchical* interpretation of the Christian commandments, of Thoreau's concept of a counter-friction to the machine, or of Camus's defiant shout of 'I rebel', has however been limited in practice by a more stubborn refusal—the refusal of most men and women to question their governments in time of war. Quite how the situation will arrive when every man and woman voluntarily renounces war has not been made clear since Dick Sheppard's campaign for peace glides rim out of steam at the start of the Second World War. But a particular pacifist position which resolves the difficulty by asserting that the universal renunciation of pacifism is inevitable, seems worthy of separate consideration.

TOLSTOY Tolstoy thought that man's realization of his Christian error and an ensuing violence would come upon him inevitably and soon, as a result of the universal dissemination of Christ's teaching. Thus it would not be many years before the truth of human equality would burst from men's consciences and make the revolution on earth. This position seems to have been modified by Ronald Sampson, who uses Freudian ideas to show why men are often unable to respond to the truth which they know inside them. His analysis in *Equality and Power* shows that personal relationships of dominance and submission are at the heart of all the political edifice which crush mankind, and as a remedy he insists on the absolute value of human equality and truthfulness. I wholeheartedly agree with this—but none the less the Tolstoyan view loses much of its power if the revolutionary transformation to be wrought by truth is no longer inevitable.

DROP-OUT The drop-out view argues that straight society is corrupt beyond redemption and that if everybody goes and lives the good life in the best way he knows, then slowly the revolution will be made for lack of bodies to keep the system going. The principles—political, economic, ecological and social—from which such a decision is taken are often admirable, but that enough people will be able to sustain it to make a revolution just doesn't seem realistic to me.

Thus these three views, the traditional pacifist, the Tolstoyan and the drop-out, have the initial value of integrating the personal with the political. They combine both a personal view in favour of revolution and a political concept of how the revolution will be made: essentially by the example of direct action and by conversion. But the condition of their coherence as political concepts is the shaky one that everybody has to share the pacifist or Tolstoyan view, or a hugely significant number has to adopt the drop-out way of life. This strikes me as not possible of achievement simply by the methods of propagandising or of living exemplary pacifist, Tolstoyan or drop-out lives. That is why I would say these views have no strategy of revolution.

So at this point I am left as a personal pacifist, agreeing that a pacifist should integrate the values of his personal life into his politics, and the values of his politics into his personal life, but not convinced that this politics is strictly a revolutionary politics at all. It is simply a radical politics.

There are three further views which I would consider as most personal and ethical positions than coherent political strategies of revolution.

BALDWIN In his book *Social Anarchism*, Giovanni Baldini describes what he calls the social capital of a society, which is the sum of all the values which hold the society together. Within this, the 'ethical capital', a crucial concept for Baldini, is the aggregate of values consistent with an anarchist society which already exist in the pre-anarchist society. Baldini believes that much of the ethical capital of society has been taken over by government, in the form of the welfare state and other public services, and by industrial capitalism—but that these activities can be liberated from such unethical institutions by the determined activities of anarchist-minded people within them. On this issue, Baldini believes that an anarchist society might be achieved without a violent revolution. Thus he calls the 'anarchization of democracy'—and it might be called a nonviolent revolutionary position because it envisages a possible wholesale transformation of our societies without the use of violence.

The view seems to be similar to that of Paul Goodman, with his notion of the 'authentic professional' who truly looks to the interest of his client, and with his concept of the 'radical revolution' in education, economics, social behaviour, and so on. It is also consistent with Everett Ruess's 'struggle for a peaceful revolution' in the 'non-political institutions' of the school, outlined in his book *School is Good*. Ruess's proposals are based on an analysis of contradictions in the school system which, if they became obvious to large numbers of people who then were disillusioned with the institution of school itself, could lead to a revolution in education. From this Ruess believes there would be major political repercussions.

Ruess's is a coherent strategy of revolution for the sphere of

education, properly based on an assessment of the social dynamics which could make the revolution. It is a useful model, I would think, for non-violent revolutionaries. However, educational institutions are only one part of a larger system. Thus Reimer's prescription, like Baldwin's and Goodman's, is for a radical politics rather than a revolution.

HARRIS A fifth position, which I would suggest is based on a personal ethic of nonviolent revolution, is one I associate with David Harris and the Institute for the Study of Nonviolence in California. Their emphasis, spelt out in Harris's book *Gandhi*, is both on a vision of the future which must be acted on now in your personal life-style and on the nonviolent process of making change which will inevitably define what you achieve. This is the revolution. You are the process which makes the revolution because the revolution is you. It is a minimalist and individualist view of great power, and is very close to Tolstoy's. In practice, these West Coast nonviolent revolutionaries concentrate on national and local issues which they invest with their particular brand of revolutionary content. But in the political sense—the second meaning from which I am considering the term—their position is not yet revolutionary because they have not worked out a strategy of making the nonviolent revolution a national and trans-national event. There seems to be simply a rhetorical updating and philosophical strengthening of radical pacifism, brilliantly concealed by the emphasis on nonviolent revolution as a process.

STONER A sixth position on nonviolent revolution was explained to me some time ago by Bob Stoner, an American Quaker direct actionist, who captained one of the Phoenix voyages to Vietnam, and he may have changed his mind more than once. On his view, as I remember it, the revolution, if and when it comes, will inevitably be violent. What we can do, as nonviolent revolutionaries living in a pre-revolutionary period, is to stage dramatic, effective and highly-publicized direct actions, with the purpose of inserting nonviolent direct action as a revolutionary means into public consciousness. Then when the revolution comes, certain sections of the revolutionary populace may choose to use it. The view is certainly logical and perhaps the least self-deceptive in terms of revolution of any that I will consider. But it does not include the concept of nonviolent revolution as such. And it requires of the non-violent revolutionary that he be willing to engage in dangerous direct action protests for the whole of his life with doubtful hopes of success. It is not a life that I would care to live.

So these farther ways of looking at nonviolent revolution don't add up to a coherent political theory of revolution. Their emphasis is clear and sound in my view: We try to make the revolution through the medium of our own lives and out of this process emerges whatever revolution there will be. The key political insight which I would take from

these positions are as follows: first, what you achieve will be determined by your manner of living now, secondly, we should not be too politically ambitious and over-reach ourselves but be practical in what we try to achieve, and thirdly, the social institutions and political methods of a post-revolutionary society will largely be determined as the pre-revolutionary society. These views are consistent with a radical pacifist position but are not necessarily revolutionary. I think it may be that we cannot yet go beyond them.

If we turn to what I am calling political concepts of nonviolent revolution, there are three which I know of. The first is the anarcho-syndicalist view of a revolutionary general strike, and the other two are concepts of nonviolent revolution as developed by two American sociologists, Martin Oppenheimer and George Luker.

SYNDICALISM. I am especially skeptical of syndicalist views but I hope the following may be a satisfactory summary of the basic position. Workers under industrial capitalism are reduced to mere factors of production and progressively deprived of their human-ness. But the system contains within it the seeds of its own contradiction, which is that the mass of men and women, so deprived, are forced to organize in self-defense. They form industrial unions, the instruments through which eventually they liberate themselves by taking over the factories. A co-ordinated general strike, coupled with massive civil disobedience and nonviolent interventionary tactics, is the means of making a nonviolent political revolution.

This conception has the virtue that the social forms which will govern at least the economic life of society after the revolution have been evolved to virtual maturity before the revolution. Moreover, it may be reinforced by the Marxist dogma that such a culmination of the historical process is inevitable. However, 100 years after Marx, the inevitability of universal socialism seems to be wishful thinking, so also the faith in industrialism as the core process generating an equitable society seems very questionable. Such factors as increasing automation which reduces workers' power, the manipulation and control of workers as economic consumers by the media and other pressures, and ecological and political questions concerning the supply of raw materials for industrial processes, all incline me against this view.

GUERRILLA. Martin Oppenheimer, in his book *Urban Guerrilla*, confesses openly that there are not the virtues in American society which make a revolution there probable. On the contrary, he says, the American system functions so well that most social groups are opposed to change. This means that the nonviolent revolutionary guerrilla will have to provoke storms in the society by tactics of intervention and disruption. Oppenheimer admits that the most likely outcome of such a strategy is a reactionary take-over of government by the extreme right.

On the other hand, if the nonviolent guerrillas led by some chance success, Oppenheimer fears that, as a minority in the population, they would have to consolidate their revolution by some new sort of bureaucratic class! So I can see no good reason for adopting Oppenheimer's strategy of nonviolent guerrilla revolution.

LARRY George Lakay's conception is altogether more impressive than this. Lakay has done most to popularize the concept of nonviolent revolution in Britain and has been instrumental in persuading War Resisters' International to proclaim it as a goal. He specifically rejects the elitist strategy of attempting to effect radical changes in the political structure before there has been a radical change in the consciousness of the people. Moreover, where there is no clink of emerging and weakening forces likely to produce a revolution, Lakay proposes what Americans call 'newspaper-building'. His strategy of revolution is worked out at a generalized level as a trans-national model for use in any part of the world and as such it concentrates heavily on the organizational aspects of building a nonviolent revolutionary movement. His suggestion of five stages in the preparation for massive internal nonviolent conflict seems graphic and well thought out. The methods of non-cooperation, civil disobedience and nonviolent intervention are well known to readers.

The strategy does not do the work which such nonviolent revolutionary movement would have to do in its own country of making the specific social analysis of forces that will make the revolution. It is also important to notice that Lakay does admit that in some situations a series of what he calls 'revolutionary reforms' forced by mass non-cooperation might so shift the distribution of power and the basis of the economy as to make the take-over of governmental authority unnecessary.

However, I do not find myself convinced by Lakay's theory for two reasons. The first is his failure as yet to apply the revolutionary model to a particular situation. If I stick to apply it in a situation I know well, Northern Ireland, maybe this difficulty will become clearer.

As I would analyse it, at the start of the nonviolent struggle of the civil rights movement in the U.S. in late 1968, the situation was as follows: (i) a local struggle (ii) within a small political unit for (iii) a just cause (iv) which was achievable without affecting the vital interests of any major group (v) within a society that was tired of political violence. Three conditions seem to me to have provided a political context that was ripe for a major nonviolent social and political transformation—what Lakay would call a revolutionary reform. The problem, quite simply, was that the people engaged in the nonviolent struggle were ordinary working class citizens who in their daily lives meet violence at every point, often feel violent and sometimes are violent, and who, just below the surface, have a trademark of political violence. The campaign therefore needed a much slower build-up than it had, using educational work

shops, nonviolent training schools and the development of alternative nonviolent social and economic forms among the people, in order that the political conflict on the streets could be waged nonviolently over a sustained period. Otherwise the re-emergence of political violence was more or less inevitable.

None of this contradicts Lakay's strategy, as I understood it, but two further points need to be made. First, that to have said that one was a revolutionary of any description in the counter context of Northern Ireland would have been (and was) disastrous, because that implied that you wished to overthrow the state. The point is that a civil rights struggle had to be politically reformist if it was to succeed in persuading Protestant people, even if its methods might be revolutionary. This distinction between politically reformist aims and revolutionary methods is important. Secondly, because members of people engaged in the struggle had professions to become politically violent under provocation, it was essential that the campaign be organised by a leadership that was firmly committed to nonviolence, knew what it was doing, and was willing and able to hold the people back from violence. Now the leadership of the civil rights movement was willing but not competent to organise this sort of nonviolent struggle, and even if it had been, its role would have been objectively alien, because the consciousness of the leadership was in advance of the movement as a whole. This point is also important.

What the first point implies is that in a situation where there was a major, if local, nonviolent struggle, it would be a sheer abstraction to suggest that the use of nonviolent means was revolutionary. In that situation, the end contained in the means was reformist and therefore the use of nonviolence was merely radical. (It may be too big a jump in the argument to shift from Northern Ireland to the situation of nonviolent revolutionary groups in Britain—but I am left wondering how much more abstract and inappropriate it is to call the use of nonviolent action in Britain revolutionary when it is conducted at a far more mundane level in even more local struggles on less significant issues? A clearer picture is needed of the take-off factor in the British context which gives these local actions revolutionary potential.)

What the example of Northern Ireland also suggests is that, in the context of a real and immediate struggle involving working class people in the use of nonviolent action, it may not be possible to develop wholly democratic methods of decision-making. The existing leadership may have to use its position of concern in order to hold back the people from taking precipitate action. Yet this means, again, that the campaign is not truly revolutionary but merely radical.

I myself believe that a successful nonviolent struggle for civil rights could, and should, have been waged in Northern Ireland along the lines

outlined above—and that this would have had scarcely imaginable social and political benefits for the people. However, this struggle would not have been a revolutionary one, but reformist in aim and radical in method.

My other difficulty with Luker's position is a bit complicated. If I understand what he is doing correctly, he is asking pacifists to make a very real conceptual leap in their thinking. Instead of taking nonviolence and making it both means and end (as the first group of theorists I considered mostly do), he appears to take revolution as the end and then try to see how this can be revolution. This requires not only that the emphasis on alternative institutions be developed, but also that it be shown how these nonviolent social forms can begin to flourish and grow within the contradictions of the old society, and how they can then go on to sustain themselves and continue to grow without losing their dynamic as a political force. We need a social and economic theory of nonviolent revolution.

In the meantime, the syndicalist position, with its emphasis on revolutionary trade unions as the alternative institution which grows out of the contradictions in capitalism, seems to be the only one I have considered which presents a coherent theory of nonviolent revolution. But I happen not to be convinced by it. So I remain sympathetic to the effort to develop a new concept of nonviolent revolution, but a bit wary of people who are already talking and acting as if it has been given to us. We still have to make the theory of nonviolent revolution.

To list some of the activists and thinkers whose work may be relevant to this task: there is the social and political theory of Gandhi and Vinoba Bhave in India, the mutual aid anarchism of Kropotkin, the creative disorder of the Protest and Rebellion in the Netherlands; the post-anarchy social change theories of Murray Bookchin, the anarchist pacifism of Dave Dellinger, the work of Dom Helder Camara and Juan Gomez in Latin America; the economic theories of Ralph Borsodi, Leopold Kohr, E.F. Schumacher and Edward Mahan, and the achievements of Lanza del Vasto in France and Danilo Golev in Sicily. To this one might add, the community development theories of Saul Alinsky, the educational theories of A.S. Noll, Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich, the management theories of Donald Schon, the ecological planning of Ian McHarg, and so on. . . . If there is the man or woman or group of people who can produce the great synthesis which will be the theory of nonviolent revolution, will they please get on with it!

None of these more seriously committed to developing the political theory of nonviolent revolution believes that this task has been completed. But it is more amusing to call yourself a nonviolent revolutionary than it is to call yourself a pacifist—and I fear that the image of nonviolent revolution is catching on faster than an awareness of the difficulties

with the concept. Those out already 'making the nonviolent revolution' almost certainly do not know how the revolution will be made and may be easily confused and disillusioned before long. That is, unless they hold firmly to a position on nonviolent revolution which is personally and ethically based and therefore not, in the more political sense, a non-violent revolutionary position at all.

Barbara Deming recently wrote that a definition of revolution could be 'The anger that is determination to bring about change'. But that is not a revolution, though it may be revolutionism. What I am saying is that we should regard this new pacifist enthusiasm for revolution with some caution.

(1) *Courtesy Peace News*, London.

Some characteristics of Gandhi's thought

I. L. MALHOTRA

THOUGHT AND LIFE: GANDHI WAS ENGAGED in the unending search for truth as it manifested itself in social life. His quest, therefore, determined the character of his thought. The truth that he sought was not a static but a dynamic entity which 'endlessly continued to unfold its myriad facets'. He moved consistently from 'truth to truth', from one state of consciousness to another, from a lower to a higher view of reality. So it was that he called the story of his life 'My Experiments with Truth'. It reveals the momentary endeavour of man to comprehend reality by the gradual process of observation and reflection, trial and error. His ideas, therefore, show a steady evolution. This means that his views on any subject must be studied in the process of its growth. It would be an error, as Ramsay Holland warns us, to attempt to judge him by whatever he said 'ten years ago'.¹ Gandhi himself advised his friends and critics that they would do well to take the meaning that his latest writing might yield whenever they were faced with any seeming inconsistency in his thought.² Only the study of his whole life and work can furnish us with a key to the correct understanding of his thought. For instance, we cannot have a correct assessment of his thought if we simply rely on his well-known work, *Hind Swaraj*, written in 1908 and which contains a scathing attack on modern industrial civilization and all its appurtenances, such as machinery, railways, hospitals etc. It is true that he did not like to make any substantial change in the book even as late as 1931. But his views, as noticed by his secretary Mahadev Desai, had by then gone through the necessary evolution.³ In *Hind Swaraj* Gandhi stated that he did not find any good in the use of machinery.⁴ But by 1924, he had come to regard only the crime for machinery as bad.⁵ It was good if it was used as a vehicle for the expression of the spirit in man and not as an instrument of man's greed. It means that machinery is bad only if its use strengthens the habits of

man or results in the exploitation of man by man.⁴

Further, an analysis of Gandhi's attack on industrial civilization shows that it was directed mostly against the evils to which it was subjected at that time and which had already been highlighted by some of his celebrated European contemporaries. For instance, he says in *My Experiments with Truth*: "This civilization is sickly and it has taken such a hold on the people in Europe that those who are in it appear to be half mad. They lack real physical strength or courage. They keep up their energy by intoxication. . . . Women, who should be queens of household, wander in the streets or they slave away in factories."⁵ In correspondence with this outlook, he told a student from Santalban in 1924, that what he was against was the abuse of machinery.⁶ So there is some weight in M.K. Bose's observation that at that time the industrial civilization was mixed up with capitalism in Gandhi's thinking.⁷ Very few, of course, could distinguish between capitalism and the industrial civilization in the West at that time, for nowhere had any effort been made to put the new means of production in the service of the common man. But with the rise of socialism, industrialism has assumed a new role and many men, both in Europe and Asia, visualize an industrial society free from all its present evils. Gandhi, too, recognized the relative value of industrialism as modified by socialism.⁸ But we would be going too far if we accepted Bose's conclusion that Gandhi's indictment was only against the capitalistic form of production and not against industrialism as such.⁹ True, he could recognize himself in the conscience of heavy industry in certain spheres of production provided that it was nationalized. But, basically, he had no fascination for mass production and centralization which are the necessary ingredients of modern industrialism.

But our discussion raises another question: 'Why did Gandhi not revise *My Experiments* if his ideas had undergone some change?' The answer involves another characteristic of Gandhi's thought. Gandhi had the knack of infusing new meaning into old words. Through this method he had pressed the ideals of ancient Indian culture to the service of modern man without altering their nomenclature. To a superficial reader Gandhi may appear a convertant on account of the frequent use that he made of traditional Hindu concepts such as *satya*, *ahimsa*, *aparigraha*, *Ramrajya*, *arjuna* etc. But as pointed out by Jomo Kossertank, Gandhi used the traditional to promote the novel.¹⁰ "He reinterpreted tradition in such a way that revolutionary ideas, clothed in familiar expression, were readily adopted and employed towards revolutionary ends."¹¹ Unconsciously he was following the ancient Indian method of adjusting old ideas to new conditions by reinterpretation. It is this approach that gave rise to the several schools of Vedanta in the past as the Hindus faced diverse situations in the long course of their history.

So Gandhi created old words, altered by him earlier or passed on to him by tradition, with new meanings. One may question the merit of this method on the ground that it leads to ambiguities in one's thought.¹¹ But words do change their colour when a man moves from one state of consciousness to another. This ambiguity can be overcome by following him in the process of his growth and by keeping in view the meaning that he attaches to a word at different times.

Again, Gandhi's effort to transform society in the light of his progressive awareness of truth linked his thought-process to the situation that he handled and the problem that he faced, for Gandhi was not an arm-chair philosopher. He did not sit down to prepare a systematic treatise of his thought. He was a man of action. Each situation draws out of him his vision of a particular aspect of truth seeking expression through social life. His right view of social life will emerge when each statement made by him on a particular subject is examined in the light of the situation that prompted the statement, as well as the whole mission of his life. Severed from the context, his statement may leave with us a wrong picture of his position with regard to a particular subject. To illustrate Gandhi once said, 'True democracy is not inconsistent with a few persons representing the spirit, the hope and the aspiration of those whom they claim to represent'.¹² Nehru gave in this approach a metaphysical view of democracy and he linked it to the communist conception, where 'a few communists', according to him, would claim to represent the real needs and desires of the masses, even though the latter may themselves be unaware of them. The mass will become a metaphysical conception with them, and it is this that they claim to represent'.¹³ But read in its proper context, Gandhi's statement gives a different impression to others. He made the statement in support of his plea for reducing the number of delegates to Congress sessions from the existing 6000 to 1000, that is, one delegate for every one thousand voters; for him, according to Gandhi, was not the true test of democracy.¹⁴ He proposed the amendment of the constitution of the Indian National Congress in order to do away with the unwieldy character of the organization. Such proposals are not inconsistent with the operation of the western mechanism of democracy. Here I may say that I am not suggesting that Nehru was unaware of the situation in which this statement was made by Gandhi. Nor do I intend to discuss here the implications of some of Gandhi's observations made on the working of democracy in the West in support of his resolution. Nevertheless, it is likely that a student of Gandhian thought may form a different impression of Gandhi's position with regard to democracy if he knows the situational context of this statement and studies it in the light of the whole experience of Gandhi about the working and value of democracy.

Further, the awareness of the context is also important in the study

of Gandhi's thought on account of the peculiar nature of his public life. All through his public life he was so intensely observed that there hardly remained any distinction between public and private life. Even remarks uttered casually or at weak moments did not go unnoticed. Narrating his experience of Gandhi's life, Reginald Reynolds observed: "With Bapu I soon realised that nothing he did was unobserved and very little that was observed was unrecorded. Can we wonder if we find unparallelled when even momentary weakness or forgetfulness was faithfully placed upon record?"¹⁸ Moreover, it was not unusual for him even to lay bare the dialectical process through which his mind was passing before arriving at the solution of a problem. Some remarks were often made to clear up his own mind. If it is so, do we do justice to him if we simply rely on an isolated statement or a chance utterance made by him while putting an interpretation upon his thought? It may be said that any person can present Gandhi in any colour or shade by selecting excerpts from Gandhi's anthologies. Reginald Reynolds observed that immediately after the death of Gandhi some 'revisionists' attempted to modify the lessons of his life by sifting upon isolated sayings of Gandhi.¹⁹ T. K. Mahabalan has rightly observed that the rapid decline, especially in India, of the academic acceptance of Gandhi is due to an error in interpretation which follows 'primarily from the unscholarly dependence of Indian intellectuals on Gandhi's anthologies'.²⁰

Again, the riddle of inconsistency in his thought may be solved if we keep in view the fact that quite often Gandhi gave two solutions of a problem, one applicable to an ideal situation and the other to a situation in which the group finds itself at any given time. The former is unusual in application and the latter bears only a relative significance. The ideal solution presupposes a state of perfection, like Euclid's straight line, which can never be fully realized but which serves as a criterion for measuring man's progress. The practical solution is a concession to man's imperfection, and since the level of imperfection varies from man to man and group to group at different times, the nature of a practical solution and its distance from the ideal changes accordingly. The ideal and the real in Gandhi are not so separated from each other as to justify the concept of 'Two Gandhis'. He is not a bundle of diametrically opposed tendencies. There is a dynamic relationship between the ideal and the real in him which Gandhi summed up as 'practical idealism'. It means that a practical idealist should pursue the ideal to the extent the given situation allows. It is this consciousness of the actual that made Gandhi give solutions which appear to some of us as involving modifications of the ideal. The point can be illustrated by the positions that he took from time to time in applying the principle of nonviolence to different situations.

His faith in nonviolence was rooted in his belief in the unity of life

that followed from his adherence to the Vedantic principle of the indwelling of the same spirit in all living beings. It implies that causing injury to any living being is tantamount to the violation of the truth of our being. But Gandhi sometimes did recommend solutions that involved the painful task of inflicting injury on living beings. Thus in the course of explaining the propriety of his participation in the Boer War, the so-called Zulu Rebellion and the First World War, Gandhi argued that his action did not constitute a lapse from ahimsa as understood by him at that time. To illustrate his point, he contemplated a situation in which the menace of monkeys to crops sometimes compels even a votary of non-violence to inflict injury on them. Gandhi argued that as a believer in the sacredness of all life it is a breach of ahimsa to inflict injury on the monkeys. But so long as he is not able to find a way of saving the crops without inflicting injury on them, he may decide to do so since he cannot think of a society where there is no agriculture.²¹

Similarly he wrote: 'While I should not take any direct part in any war, I can conceive occasions when it would be my duty to vote for the military training of those who wish to take it. For I know that all members [of society] do not believe in nonviolence to the extent I do. It is not possible to make a person or a society nonviolent by compulsion.'²²

Likewise, his advice to the soldiers sent by the Indian Government to defend Kashmir against the attack of Pakistan terrorists in 1947, squares well with this approach to nonviolence. Gandhi said that he 'would not shed a tear if the little Union force was wiped out, like the Spartans, bravely defending Kashmir'.²³ These words shocked some of his admirers, for Gandhi had advised the British people during the Second World War that they should not fight Hitler but oppose him by nonviolence and spiritual force. Gandhi argued that his advice to the soldiers of the Indian Government was in no way a lapse from the creed of nonviolence. What he said was that 'he had no influence in the matter over his friends in the Union Cabinet'. He held on to his views on nonviolence as firmly as ever, but he would not impose his views on his friends, as they were, in the Cabinet.²⁴ He suggested that if the Union Government had not enough faith in nonviolence, it was better for it to use violence than to submit to the ruthless invader, for in Gandhi's scale of values violence was preferable to cowardice, though nonviolence was superior to violence. Moreover, his adherence to nonviolence did not prevent him from giving credit where it was due, even though the creditor was a believer in violence.²⁵

This approach to nonviolence stipulates that nonviolent solutions cannot be imposed on a society which has neither any faith in nonviolence nor any training for nonviolent action.²⁶ This means that the extent to which a group can practise nonviolence depends upon the spiritual level of its members and their capacity for suffering. Many of the doubts

about Gandhi's position with regard to his pursuit of nonviolence would disappear if we kept in view the way he tried to give shape to the ideal in the light of existing realities. But it is not suggested that all his actions or statements can be justified on the basis of this approach. Some of the adherents of nonviolence, like Reginald Reynolds, may still object to his statement characterizing Polish resistance to the German invasion as 'almost nonviolent'.¹⁷ Others may find his advice to the British to resist Hitler by spiritual force irreconcilable with the general position that he maintained with regard to the pursuit of nonviolence. But the right approach to Gandhi's thought does not involve us in any commitment or undertaking to defend every statement that he made. A systematic study of Gandhi does not mean that we start with the assumption that he was a system-maker and, therefore, that there was a logical consistency in all his statements. We only insist that before pronouncing any judgement on the validity or value of his views on any subject we should first try to understand the way his mind worked.

1. *Musketier, The Spirit's Pilgrimage* (London: Longmans Green, 1962) p. 148.
2. D.G. Tendulkar, *Mohandas* (New Delhi: Publications Division, 1962) vol. v, p. 168.
3. M.K. Gandhi, *Autobiography* (Ahmedabad: Navrang Publishing House, 1961) p. 5.
4. M.K. Gandhi, *Op. cit.*, p. 76.
5. D.G. Tendulkar, *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 161. 6. *Ibid.*
7. M.K. Gandhi, *Op. cit.*, p. 37. 8. D.G. Tendulkar, *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 162.
9. Harpal Kumar Bhas and P.H. Parashar, *Gandhi in Indian Politics* (Bombay: Lalit Publishing House, 1967) p. 11.
10. S. Radhakrishnan, *Mohandas Gandhi: Essays and Reflections* (Bombay: Janta Publishing House, 1955) p. 265.
11. Harpal Kumar Bhas, *Op. cit.*
12. Jean A. Boudreau, *Concept of Mohandas* (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1958) p. 105.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Mohandas Autobiography*, p. 72.
15. D.G. Tendulkar, *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 308.
16. *Mohandas*, *Op. cit.*, p. 211.
17. D.G. Tendulkar, *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 321.
18. Reginald Reynolds, *To Live as Muslims* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1951) p. 19.
19. Reginald Reynolds, *Op. cit.*, p. 121.
20. T.K. Mohandas, 'An Approach to the Study of Gandhi' in *Gandhi*, vol. 1, edited by H.N. Ranjan Ray (Calcutta: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1962) p. 45.
21. *Young India*, 13/8 1932. 22. *Ibid.*
23. M.K. Gandhi, *Autobiography* (Ahmedabad: Navrang Publishing House, 1961) p. 127.
24. *Ibid.* p. 144. 25. *Ibid.*
26. *Pyarelal, The Last Phase*, vol. v, pp. 361-362; also, M.K. Bhas, *Op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.
27. Reginald Reynolds, *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

Meditations on Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed—II

THOMAS HYELOP

WHO WAS CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY GHOST, BORN OF THE VIRGIN
MARY.

A FAMOUS NINETEENTH CENTURY HINDU was Ramakrishna, who was a priest of the Kali Temple at Dakshineswar, a village situated on the Ganges, some four miles north of Calcutta. Born in 1836 and dying fifty years afterwards, he has acquired many followers throughout the world, the late Aldous Huxley having been one of them.

'The story of Ramakrishna Paramahansa's life', Gandhi maintained, writing a Foreword to a biography of the sect, 'is a story of religion in practice. His life enables us to see God face to face. No one can read the story of his life without being convinced that God alone is real and that all else is an illusion. Ramakrishna is a living embodiment of godliness. His sayings are not those of a mere learned man but they are pages from the Book of Life. They are revelations of his own experiences. They therefore leave on the reader an impression which he cannot erase. In this age of scepticism Ramakrishna presents an example of a bright and living faith which gives solace to thousands of men and women who would otherwise have remained without spiritual light. Ramakrishna's life was an object lesson in stages. His love knew no limits geographical or otherwise. May his divine love be an inspiration to all who read the following pages.'

Ramakrishna's latest biographer is another English man of letters, Christopher Isherwood, who, like Aldous Huxley, migrated to America. He has been a devotee of the Ramakrishna Order, translated into English the *Angerashras* and two other Hindu scriptures. He is thus an intellectual not incapable of infusing alleged facts.

Ramakrishna's parents, Khadram Chattopadhyaya and Chandra Devi, both of them pious and visionary, were married in 1799. Before

Ramakrishna made his appearance, they had already begotten three other children, two sons and a daughter, and, after the first saw the light of day, a second daughter was born. Ramakrishna came into the world as Kamarpukur, a village in Bengal, and the circumstances of the event are said to have been as follows. In 1830 Khadram, then aged 20½, made a pilgrimage to Gaya, where a supposed imprint of the feet of the god, Vishnu, can be seen, and, while he was at this much frequented sacred place, Vishnu himself, visible to Khadram in a dream, promised soon to be born as his son. At about the same time Chandra Devi, who had remained at home, also had a dream. She dreamed that she was possessed by the divine and a few days later, while standing wide awake before the temple situated opposite her cottage, she had a completely overwhelming experience. The image of the god, Shiva, came to life before her eyes and a ray of light entered her. She fainted and, when she regained consciousness, discovered that she had conceived. The husband, on his return, found his wife transfigured and was of course interested to hear the news. Chandra, who was forty-five, now had, until the babe was delivered, almost daily visions of gods and goddesses and the name, Gadadhar, by which Ramakrishna was at first known, means the Master of the Mass, an epithet applied to Vishnu.

Although this story was deemed to be legendary by Romain Rolland and Max Mueller, two of Ramakrishna's western admirers, its truth was vouched for, as Christopher Isherwood pointed out with considerable emphasis, by all the seer's original disciples, people who, being deeply religious, regarded lying as a great obstacle to one's spiritual progress. Isherwood has further reminded us that the leader of those disciples, Vivekananda, who was not only very sceptical by nature, but also had received a western, agnostic education in Calcutta, was not the man to believe a tale on insufficient evidence. It is therefore impossible, according to Isherwood, to accuse the first followers of spreading a falsehood.

When I came across this oriental story of a more or less modern miraculous conception, I was not a little impressed. Personally I am persuaded that, if the story is true, the Christmas narrative is hardly incredible. Nor would appear to be the claim that the Lord Krishna and the Lord Buddha were similarly conceived. It is not inappropriate that a religious genre should be miraculously born.

Arthur Osborne wrote a biography, which has a Foreword by the philosopher statesman, Dr S. Radhakrishnan, until recently President of the Republic of India, of Ramana Maharshi, another seer of renown, who was living in southern India between 1879 and 1950. On perusing the work, I noted that, precisely as Ramana died, an enormous star slowly trailed across the sky. I noted that many saw this heavenly body and felt what it portended. Then I was inevitably reminded of the star

of Bethlehem.

Remember that, according to the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church, not only had Jesus no maternal father but also, after he had been born, Mary continued to be, what she ever remained, a virgin. It is therefore suggested by members of these two organisations that James, the Lord's brother, was James the Less, a first cousin of Jesus, near kinsfolk having been frequently described by the ancient Jews as brothers and sisters.

On the other hand Gandhi, like his fellow worker and very great friend, the English underconversional Christian, C F Andrews, who was an Anglican priest, did not accept the doctrine of the virgin birth of Jesus the Christ. 'I should find it hard to believe', he avowed, 'in the literal meaning of the verses relating to the immaculate conception of Jesus. Nor would it deepen my regard for Jesus if I gave those verses their literal meaning. This does not mean that the writers of the Gospels were untruthful persons. They wrote in a mood of exaltation.'

If you too cannot subscribe to this belief, you can tell yourself that the Greek word, *parthenos*, which is translated as virgin, actually signifies a mature young woman and therefore that you do not necessarily imply, when you utter this clause, that you think the birth of Jesus to have been in any way extraordinary. You can also point out that the phrase, by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, is not to be found in the original version of the Nicene Creed.

Every birth can of course be described as the work of the Spirit of God.

STAYING UNDER PONTIUS PILATE, WAS CRUCIFIED, DEAD, AND
BURIED, HE DESCENDED INTO HELL;

Pontius Pilate, who, while the trial of Jesus was in progress, seems to have had sympathy for the accused, was doubtless not altogether a bad man, but nevertheless, the tool of a system. This Roman curator, as well known throughout Christendom down the centuries, inevitably symbolises the state, despotism, a ruling class, imperialism, pride, snobbery, class distinction, apartheid, all of which the Mahatma, a non-violent anarchist, an advocate of decentralisation, felt to be an unmitigated evil and therefore wanted to see liquidated. Gandhi maintained that, if every individual would strive to become a perfect servant, there would be no further need for nations to be highly organised as states and, pointing out that, when power is wielded by the few, it corrupts both them and the governed, he recommended a stateless democracy.

His constructive program was as follows: Within a nation there should be small communities, each as far as practicable managing its own affairs. In India, where there are seven hundred thousand villages,

every village should be looked after by a council of five, a *panchayat*, which, elected annually by all adults, should be regarded as the legislature, judiciary and executive of the place. The villagers, acting cooperatively and as a family, should produce their own food, clothing, milk, soap, paper, matches, electricity, sanitation, water supply and other necessities. They should have their own places of worship, playground, school and public hall. Handicrafts should be learned and women emancipated.

For purposes of mutual interest each village republic should be loosely federated. Therefore, the *panchayats* of a district should elect a district administration, district administrations should elect provincial administrations and these last should elect a central government, but there should always be the largest measure possible of local autonomy. Thus would the individual, inwardly ruling himself and eager to be of service to others, enjoy the maximum of personal freedom.

Because condemning centralization, the *Misistras* naturally disliked large cities and, although this aversion seems common to most westerners, many famous thinkers, Plato among them, have advocated small communities and these last should elect a central government, but there should always be the largest measure possible of local autonomy. Thus would the individual, inwardly ruling himself and eager to be of service to others, enjoy the maximum of personal freedom.

Because condemning centralization, the *Misistras* naturally disliked large cities and, although this aversion seems common to most westerners, many famous thinkers, Plato among them, have advocated small communities and these last should elect a central government, but there should always be the largest measure possible of local autonomy. Thus would the individual, inwardly ruling himself and eager to be of service to others, enjoy the maximum of personal freedom.

‘Experience shows’, wrote Aristotle, ‘that a populous city can seldom, if ever, be properly governed. Well-governed cities have a limited population.’

‘Cities are’, Rousseau averred, ‘the abyss of the human species. At the end of a few generations in them races perish or degenerate and it is necessary to renew them. This renewal always comes from the country.’

‘When we get piled upon one another in large cities as in Europe’, wrote Thomas Jefferson in America in 1777, ‘we shall become as corrupt as Europe.’

‘Fifty thousand people gathered in a single place’, Lewis Mumford maintained in his book, *The Culture of Cities*, ‘can do fewer things together than twenty-five groups of two thousand.’ ‘Discussions lose words’, he further pointed out, ‘and seek to provide bigger areas and architectures for them, the bigger the crowd, the emptier their function.’ Finally remember what, when he was delivering his North Lectures, Bertrand Russell said. ‘The dearth of art and prophecy in the present age is the inevitable result’, he proclaimed, ‘of the fact that society is centralized and organized to such a degree that individual initiative is reduced to a minimum.’

I noticed that, while addressing the British Association in Leeds in 1963, the industrial economist, Professor Philip Florence, offered for our benefit a most timely warning. He asserted that, if such conurbations as London and Manchester, Birmingham and the Black Country,

Marseyade and Clydeade, Leeds and Bradford continue to grow unplanned with the current rapidity, we will have on this island by 2000 A.D. a complete nightmare of sprawling town areas, jammed roads and wretched countryside, the congestion being not only frightful, but also extremely expensive.¹

Although Gandhi definitely condemned the industrial revolution, he was not against machinery as such. What he objected to was mass production, the profit motive, the control of markets and raw materials, the creation of slums, the throwing of peasants out of work, the concentration of production and distribution in the hands of the few. He fully realized that there must be a certain amount of industrialization, but he hoped that, as far as possible, tools and machines would be made for the small, rural community. He maintained that the wealth of a nation should be shared by all.

Thinking that key industries should be nationalized, he asserted that the relation between employers and employed should be fair. Each side should have for the other a feeling of profound sympathy. Management and labour should jointly control the enterprise and, should they experience any disagreement, an impartial tribunal should be set up to give judgment. The wages of all, which should be as nearly equal as practicable, should be sufficient for well being and for reasonable comfort and, as the condition of labour should be either tiring or conducive to ill health, there should be at every factory recreation facilities, satisfactory sanitary arrangements and enough water. The management should provide for the workers, without in any way impairing the freedom of the latter, suitable housing. Workers should have a right to form unions, to bargain collectively and, in the event of the management making excessive demands, to strike.

As Gandhi condemned the class war so vehemently encouraged by the communists, he put forth the ideal of trusteeship. He maintained that the rich should, after having deliberately and gladly lowered their standard of living, use their surplus wealth for the good of the needy. That is why he regarded Jesus, who told that young aristocrat to sell up and give to the poor, as the greatest economist of the time. The Mahatma proclaimed, when the Russian ruler had, that revolution, however inevitable, should be pacific.

Aware that, even after the ideal society has been largely realized and, as a result, the human race has grown more content than ever before, crime will, although very much reduced, to some extent persist, Gandhi averred that prisons, which will therefore still be necessary, should be envisaged not as institutions for the punishment of malefactors, but as rehabilitation centres for the socially maladjusted, jail officials thus becoming the friends, instructors and spiritual advisors of the inmates. The death penalty should, according to him, be entirely abolished.

Gandhi assumed that similarly there will always have to be a police force, but that the members of it should, far from being, as now, protagonists of violence, evolve into a police brigade dedicated to the propagation of ahimsa. He held that, although these new police might have to be armed to deal with robber, murderer and lunatic, the weapons should be resorted to but rarely. When they were used, there would be, as he of course fully realised, a most tragic departure from the ideal of love.

Feeling not only that, should a dispute arise or a crime be committed, it ought to be privately and without bitterness settled by the parties involved, but also that, when such a procedure unfortunately cannot be followed, the *panchayat* should arbitrate. Gandhi was of the opinion that state law courts can never be entirely abolished, but he maintained that these should seldom be used and that, if unavoidably availed of, they should be cheap, speedy and efficient.

So that the young might be adequately prepared for the good society, Gandhi devised his system of home education. By this method, schooling should be imparted through marketable manual labour, for instance carding cotton, spinning, weaving, carpentry and gardening, in order to heal the rift between intellectualism and everyday life, and for all between the ages of seven and fourteen should be free and compulsory. As India is a land of so many religions, upholders of which are frequently hostile to one another, the Mahatma proclaimed that no theological instruction should be given in schools, but that pupils should be taught, by means of both the precept and the example of the teachers, the ideology of love common to all the higher religions of mankind.

According to this great pacifist, there should be disarmament followed by a freely elected, properly democratic world government. He thought that perhaps a particular nation, distinguished by the heroism and purity of a majority of its members, will have, in order to set the fashions of practising ahimsa, to disarm unilaterally and that, if it should then be invaded, it ought to resist civilly and without violence.

Should a rural community have a dramatic society, a sensible play would be one proclaiming ahimsa. I was impressed by a specimen which, published in 1949 by the Malayalam writer, Edasseri Govindan Nayar, is entitled *Jest Forging*. The scene is a southern Malabar village in which are six landholders, the fragmentation of peasant holdings, quarrels between Hindus and Muslims, strife between castes. There are two families, both of them in difficulties, one high caste Hindu and the other Muslim, the first landholder and the second tenant. When the old-fashioned head of the Hindu family dies, the new head, a young man imbued with gandhian ideals, Sridharan Nayar by name, wishes to end the litigation which, owing to the attempt of the deceased to evict Abu Bakar, the tenant, an old man, is in progress between the two families. He therefore

propose, what Abu Bakr agrees to, joint farming and common labour, a cooperative endeavour which is joined by Yehi, a low caste neighbour. Although they have to endure the opposition of reactionaries, they eventually reap a spectacular harvest which converts many an erstwhile enemy. In act two scene two, is a song in praise of the Mahatma, a song described by Abu Bakr as an incantation evoking confidence and the determination to work.

Ramakrishna had cancer of the throat, the disease which eventually killed him, and, as he had the power of withdrawing mind from body and thus experiencing the supreme identity, he was able, whenever the doctors wished to treat the malady, to transmute the power and in consequence feel no pain. Similarly one of the disciples, Swami Turyananda, on having to undergo a major operation and, through age and infirmity, being unable to take an anesthetic, withdrew mind from body and, to the great amazement of the surgeon, not only, while the proceeding was in progress, talked about God to the young monks present, but also showed not the slightest distortion of facial muscles and, the proceeding over, sang a hymn. These facts are given by Swami Akhilananda of the Ramakrishna Order in his book, *Minor's Health and Hindu Psychology*, and, as the author therein reminded us too, Ramakrishna opined that in the same way Jesus did not feel the crucifixion.

I have in my library two rare book written by Sri Paramahansa, the one a commentary on St Matthew's Gospel, the other a commentary on the Gospel according to St John, the first published in 1898, the second in 1903, and, in the view of this Indian writer, Jesus did not die on the cross, but went into a religious trance there and, after being placed in the tomb, regained consciousness and so eventually appeared to the disciples. Although this theory has been put forward from time to time by others as well, for instance, nowadays by members of the strictly non-violent Order of the Cross, there seems to be no evidence whatsoever to support it and, as can be learned from the statement that he descended into hell, that is to say into the realm of departed spirits, it has been vigorously asserted by the main body of Christians that their Lord really did die.

The Mahatma has pointed out that "even as Buddha and Christ chastised they showed unmistakable gentleness and love behind every act of them. They would not raise a finger against their enemies, but would gladly surrender themselves rather than the truth for which they lived. Buddha would have died retaining the priesthood, if the majority of his love had not proved to be equal to the task of heading the priesthood. Christ died on the Cross with a crown of thorns on his head defying the might of a whole Empire."

THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD, HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN, AND SITTING ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, FROM THENCE HE SHALL COME TO JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD.

According to Christopher Isherwood, Ramakrishna made posthumous appearances. A few hours after the passing away of the acur, while Sarada Devi, his wife, following the Hindu custom, was, as a sign of her widowhood, removing her ornaments, he manifested himself and, taking her by the wrist, asked her not only why she was doing this, but also whether she really believed him to be dead. In consequence Sarada continued to wear her braids.

A week later, when Naren, subsequently to be known to the world as Swami Vivekananda, and another devotee, Harish by name, were standing near a pond in a garden, the former suddenly witnessed a draped, shaven figure coming towards them and, although, thinking that he might be the victim of a hallucination, he at first said nothing. Harish, thus indicating that he too saw the form, exclaimed, "What is that?" "Who is there?", then shouted Naren and, on hearing the noise, other disciples emerged from a house close by, but the figure disappeared near a summer bath about ten yards away.

Some months afterwards Saradadevi Nath Mitra, while meditating in his domestic shrine, was visited by Ramakrishna, who exhorted him to procure a house for the monastic disciples. Appropriate shelter was therefore soon found.

Sarada Devi, who evolved into a saint and came to be known as the Holy Mother, repeatedly saw her deceased husband. He taught her to be a spiritual dancer and once, as she was travelling by train to Vrindavan, he appeared at the carriage window, where he told her not to lose his gold snuff. After she had reached her destination, he re-appeared to remind her that he was still alive and, while she was in Vrindavan, he asked her to visit Jogindra, but, until he had manifested himself to her on two more occasions, she could not summon up enough courage to perform the task. Eventually she learned that Ramakrishna, having appeared to Jogindra also, had told him to receive initiation from her.

Likewise, Arthur Osborne has informed us that, after Ramana Maharshi had died, the modern man's continued presence and guidance were vividly felt by the devotees. For instance, a retired medical man, Dr D D. Asharya, bent in the evening of his life upon experiencing the Truth, decided, despite the acur's decree, to settle down at Ramanashram, where he put his healing skill at the disposal of those around him. When he had despondently thought that he was making no spiritual progress, he suddenly saw in a dream Sri Ramana, who, although they

had never met on earth, marvellously comforted him.

I was fascinated by the work, *Autobiography of a Yogi*, which, written by Paramahansa Yogananda, has a preface by the distinguished orientalist, W.Y. Evans-Wentz. As can be learned from the book, Paramahansa Yogananda's guru, that is to say his spiritual director, was Sri Yukteswar, an attractive personality, tall, straight, ascetic and of gentle manner and voice, whom Dr Evans-Wentz met and admired, and on 9 March 1936, this guru, then aged eighty-one, passed away. At three o'clock in the afternoon of 19 June 1936, while Paramahansa Yogananda was sitting on a bed in a Bombay hotel, he suddenly beheld the flesh and blood form of Sri Yukteswar, who, explaining that he had created for himself a new body from cosmic atoms, spoke at some length about the hereafter. He had hitherto posthumously appeared on 16 March 1936 to another disciple.

We are further informed in the work that, after he had died at the age of sixty-six on 26 September 1891, Lahori Mahasaya, Sri Yukteswar's guru, simultaneously appeared on the following morning at ten o'clock to three of his followers, each of them in a different city. He told one of the followers, Keshubchandra, that the remodelled form was made from the transmigrated atoms of the cremated body.

Even ordinary people sometimes reveal themselves after death. Here are two stories presented in his book, *A Biographical Outlook for Modern Man*, by Raynor C. Johnson: the first taken from the writings of the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead, the second quoted from the Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research.

The bell rang in a minute and, on the minister going to the door, he found a young woman, whom he knew fairly well, but whom, as she lived five miles away, he had not seen for sixteen months. She asked whether he would visit her dying father and immediately, the accompanying him, he set out on the five mile walk. Arrived at the house, the minister was welcomed by the young woman's mother, who asked how he had heard of the trouble. He explained that the daughter had brought a message, but, when the man had soon afterwards passed away, the widow, newly bereaved and completely astounded, told the minister that the daughter had died a year ago. It so happened that, while walking over, he had passed two road workers and, now equally amazed, he decided that, should he meet them on his way home, he would ask them whether, when they previously saw him, he had a young woman with him. He did meet them again and, on his putting that question to them, one of them replied that, when passing them before, he was alone and talking away to himself as fast as he could go.

The next story is about a Mr James L. Chaffin, a farmer of North Carolina in the United States of America. On 16 November 1905, he made a will wherein, thus failing to provide for his wife and other three

sons, he left his property to his third son, Marshall, but on 16 January 1919, presumably repenting of this unfair procedure, he made a second will, which was unexecuted, and placed it between two pages of a Bible. The eccentric farmer then wrote on a piece of paper the words, 'Read the 27th chapter of Genesis in my daddy's old Bible', put the paper in the inner pocket of his overcoat and stitched the pocket up. He died on 7 September 1921, and, as no other person knew of the existence of the second will, Marshall duly obtained probate of the original one. In June 1925, the second son, James, began to have a series of vivid dreams about his late father, in which the latter, clad in his black overcoat said, 'You will find my will in my overcoat pocket', and, as a result, James, taking with him others as witnesses, found overcoat, paper, Bible and second will. There followed in December 1925 a lawsuit, the upshot being that the second will was pronounced valid.

Mindful of such psychic phenomena as these have recounted, I have no difficulty in believing that Jesus Christ, having risen from the dead, made a number of spectacular flesh and blood appearances.

After Ramana Mahanishi had died, his influence upon his devotees was, according to Arthur Osborne, even more potent than it had been before the decease, and Mahatma Gandhi, commiserating with Sri Anand Hingorani on the passing of the latter's wife, wrote as follows: 'You must not brood over Vidya's death nor get disconcerted. If she was the inspiration of your life whilst she was in the flesh, she must be more so, having gone to her resting place. That to me is the meaning of the true union of souls. The classic example is that of Jesus and in modern times of Ramakrishna. They became greater influences after their death. Their spirit did not die, nor is Vidya's dead. You must, therefore, leave off sorrowing and think of your duty in front of you.'¹

Similarly Devadas, Gandhi's fourth son, who was managing editor of the *Minchaster Times*, said in a speech broadcast to the Indian nation on 5 February 1948, that is to say less than a week after his father's martyrdom, 'I would not waste time or emotion in fruitless sorrow over God's will. Bapu himself is in bliss. We no longer have his physical presence. But his spirit will guide and help us.'²

And at about the same time Mirabai, the daughter of a British admiral and one of the Mahatma's most faithful followers, wrote in an article, 'For me there were only two, God and Bapu. And now they have become one!'

'When I heard the news something deep, deep down within me opened—the door to the imprisoned soul—and Bapu's spirit entered there. From that moment a new sense of the eternal abides with me.

'Though Bapu's beloved physical presence is no longer with us, yet his sacred spirit is even nearer. Sometimes Bapu had said to me, "When the body is no more there will not be separation, but I shall be nearer to

you. The body is a hindrance." Now I know, through experience, the divine truth of these words."¹

Even Jawaharlal Nehru whose outlook was, in spite of his great admiration for the Mahatma, secular rather than religious, was, according to Margaret Bourke-White, the American photographer, able publicly to say soon after the assassination of his hero, "The great light is extinguished. Darkness of sorrow and distress surrounds us all. I have no doubt he will continue to guide us from the borders of the Great Beyond."²

Just before he entered the prison, Jesus gave a long discourse about his second coming. He said that, when he returned to earth to establish the Kingdom of God, he would, accompanied by angels, messengers, to assist him in his work, come on the clouds of heaven with power and glory and that, although he did not know the day or hour of the event, it would take place before the contemporary generation had passed away. He mentioned that there would be definite signs of this coming, namely, war, earthquakes, famines, pestilences, the persecution of Christians, the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars from the firmament, the shaking of the celestial powers.

As Jesus in fact did not return in that way, it is extremely difficult to fathom what in this complicated speech he meant. We know that he was wont to speak parabolically and thus, according to some commentators, he was revealing that at a future date he would be reincarnated on earth and, in the view of others, he was asserting that he would in due course be followed by further incarnations, avatars. I am inclined to accept the latter suggestion.

At any rate, when we say that Jesus will come to judge the quick and the dead, we are expressing the belief that he continues to rule and guide us. In his book, *The Christian Creed*, Bishop C.W. Leadbeater, who, a notable theological leader, was one of the founders of the Liberal Catholic Church, reminded us that in the English of Queen Elizabeth I's day, the word 'judge', had a wider meaning than it possesses now and, to prove his point he presented two quotations from the Book of Judges in the Old Testament, the first being that 'Deborah judged Israel at that time', the second that Jael, a Gileadite, 'judged Israel twenty and two years' [so as contrasted]

1. *Hindoo*, 12 4 36.

2. *Daily Mail*, 29 67.

3. *Young India*, 12 5 30.

4. *Hindoo*, 12 7 48.

5. *The Gandhi Reader: A Source Book of his Life and Writings*, Edited by Homer A. Jack (London: Dornes Defence, 1934) p. 439.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 451.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 462.

What is the most worthwhile work?

MARIE B. BYLES

'This world of men suffers bondage from all action save that which is done for the sake of sacrifice; to this end performs action without attachment' *Disputed Gita*, 3.9. [Gandhi's comment: 'Action for the sake of sacrifice' means acts of selfless service dedicated to God.] 'Cast all thy acts on Me, with thy mind fixed on the indwelling Atman, and without any thought of fruit, or sense of 'me', shake off thy fever and light.' *Ibid.*, 5.30. 'Better one's own duty, heretofore of merit, than another's well performed, better a death in discharge of one's duty, another's duty is fraught with danger' *Ibid.*, 5.35.

In the midst of so much sincerely earnest work to stop the manufacture of nuclear weapons, or the war in Vietnam, or injustices to Negroes, or the rising population of India, and the like, do the followers of the Mahatma ever enquire whether these and the many other worthy causes are really the most important? Do they ever remember back to the fact that he never invited anyone to leave his own work to join the non-violent campaign for Indian independence, and that for him the worthwhileness of any work was not the objective but the spirit in which it is done.

In *Gandhi May* of October 1965 I tried to shed light on the basis of nonviolence by looking at the teaching of Tenko San, the Japanese spiritual leader. In this I shall try to show how Tenko San's teaching throws light on Gandhi's and the *Gita's* conception of the ingredients without which no work, not even trying to stop the manufacture of nuclear weapons, is of any value.

Unlike Gandhi's, Tenko San's life work did not begin with public service. He only once entered Parliament, and when he found his wisdom was not understood there, he did not stand for a second term of office. He exercised a tremendous influence on the moral and spiritual life of Japan, an influence even observed by the *New York Times*. But

it was not in public life. Like Gandhi, however, his work was inspired by a religious experience from which he realized that if we serve others without thought of self or reward for self, but solely as a thank offering to Light (or God) for the opportunity of doing it, then all that is required for our sustenance will come of its own accord as milk comes to the mother's breasts when the babe is born.

What follows is the story of my own experience when living with his lay disciples and with his community of about 300 men, women and children known as *Itosen*. *Itosen* came into existence at the beginning of this century from the small band of men and women who gathered around him to do without payment the menial work that anyone would give them. It was very different from the work that Gandhi undertook, but it agrees perfectly with the quotations that head this essay and which were the criterion by which Gandhi would have judged the worthwhileness of any work. Perhaps a study of these experiences will enable us to be more critical of the spirit in which we, the followers of Gandhi, are performing whatever work we do.

Almost the first thing I learned was that, for Tenko San, cleaning other people's toilets was the most important and significant of all work, cleaning, not emptying (the farmers need the contents for manure too badly to spare it for strangers to empty, and of course some of the toilets cleaned are reserved). Toilet cleaning has become for *Itosen* a religious ritual, and the children are trained to take part in it as soon as they are in senior high school. The men and women who come to *Itosen* for the monthly four-day training course find it is first on the schedule. Finally several times during the year *Itosen's* members go to distant places for *Gyogan*, as it is called.

Why did Tenko San regard this humble, not very pleasant, work as the most worthwhile?

I went on three *Gyogan* expeditions during the two periods I was in Japan.

The first I have described in *Partis to Inner Calm*. It was part of the four days' monthly training course to which about seventy trainees came. We assembled in the school playground. Ayako San, the English teacher, had dressed me like the others in a short black kimono and white headscarf with the circle of ocarinas in front. We chanted the *Gyogan* poem and then we each picked up a bucket, small bamboo brush and a thick rag, and marched out single file between an avenue of *Itosen's* members holding their hands prayerwise, crossed the canal and passed down the street to the village.

It was a long walk and the sun was hot. I began to get very tired until I remembered that I was doing this work for the Light. And then somewhat to my own surprise the tiredness disappeared.

Ayako San stopped opposite a temple and our assignment start-

ed later. The rest of the long line continued on.

We knocked at the door and a general priest of the Jodo Sect opened it. Ayako San said, "We are from Hiroshi. May we clean your obengo (humble toilet) for the sake of the peace of the world and our own atonement of selfishness?" The priest thanked her and showed us what was a very clean obengo. However, we made it a little cleaner still. Afterwards I asked him through Ayako San what he thought of Hiroshi's toilet cleaning. Were we mad, stupid or of use? He replied that he was very grateful to us.

The same formula was repeated at every house. Several women said they had already cleaned the toilet. At some houses everyone was away. The ones down a back alley included a really filthy obengo and the mother, who was washing clothes with the assistance of her baby in the tiny backyard, was generously grateful and gave us soap and water to clean our hands when we had finished. At another there was no tap from which to draw the water, we had to dip it out of the stream that runs through the township and afterwards empty the bucket and wash the rug and brush in the same stream.

After about an hour our arguments ended. I had seen the inside of many poor houses—as well as become an authority on the cleanliness of obengos!

When we returned one of the older men greeted us with hands-prayer-wise, and I felt, rightly or wrongly, that I had been accepted into Hiroshi. Also, people now seemed to notice me and greet me with a smile as one of themselves.

To me it was an interesting adventure. I did not pretend to understand the why and wherefore. It made an amusing incident in lectures that I gave about Hiroshi when I returned home.

The second Gyogan expedition was at Ito, where Makoto Ohashi San, a member of Hiroshi, took me to visit a retired electrical contractor, and lay member of Hiroshi. After lunch we set off with white head scarf, bucket, brush and rug, crossed the railway line and called on at the first house along the narrow main street of the village. In response to Makoto San's request the young man of the house readily showed us the toilet. After we had duly cleaned it I asked through Makoto San the same question as Ayako San had asked the general Jodo priest. He replied that it was a very mysterious art. Makoto San said he was a serious young man and understood. We proceeded down the street and called on at many other houses and were refused, and in between I snapped Makoto San walking down the street with his long black kim tucked up and showing white pants underneath. I admit I was concerned to tell the story at lectures afterwards. I still did not understand what it was all about. The man at the last house acceded at once to Makoto San's pleading. He belonged to one of the hundred and seventy-one new religions of Japan.

(see Harry Thurman's *The New Religions of Japan*) and a number of devotees were gathered in his house for a meeting of worship. He of course understood our reason for wanting to clean the toilet, and seized the opportunity to give us some literature concerning his own religion.

I found out afterwards that Makoto San had been deeply hurt at my completely detached interest in what for him was a religious undertaking. He said that my flippant attitude had hindered him in what was a difficult matter even when our prayer was granted, still more when it was refused. I did not know I had been flippant, and I was most unhappy that I had hurt the feelings of the man who had done so much to help me. After my return home I received a rather pathetic letter from one of my English pupils at Itozan in which she told me about their Gyogan expedition and how very glad she was anyone did let them clean the toilet.

Trains came for the monthly four-day training course soon after I arrived at Itozan on my second visit to Japan. There were about forty men and twenty women. The worship hall was fairly full for the 3.30 a.m. sessu chanting. I noticed that some of the men masters were obviously not accustomed to kneeling on tatami mats, and occasionally knelt up Roman Catholic style to ease their aching ankles.¹ At 5 a.m. they brought the sutra books with them and gathered in the school playground as previously. Each line was headed by an experienced man or woman Itozan member according to the sex of the trainees. They read the sutra as they chanted and their attitude was one of deep dedication and solemnity. They then took up bucket, rag and brush and set forth in a long defile between the avenue of Itozan members with hands prayerwise. This time I formed part of the avenue except that from time to time I broke away to take photos. Dear, dear, finding Tenko San was taken in his wheel chair, helped out, and stood all alone at the roadside with hands prayerwise to bless them as they passed. It was obviously the work dearest to his heart and he was tremendously happy to see the men and women file past him.

A month later trainees came again, well over seventy of them, and this time, when Itozan members were also assembled, the worship hall was so packed that the men being in the majority overflowed onto the women's side.

This time at my request Ayako San again took me on the expedition. But my back had been getting steadily worse and I was walking with a limp, and when I heard that we had a long way to go I said I must get a taxi—wholly out of tune with Gyogan of course, but I could not have managed otherwise. I pictured us coming by taxi to the scene of action just after the trainees. But Japanese taxis have a habit of arriving ten minutes early, and somehow it got mixed up in the procession. I was aghast, and extremely miserable mentally as well as physically! I

am afraid I got almost angry trying to convince Ayako San that she simply must make the tea wait until everyone had got away.

We paid the tea off when we reached the place assigned and continued on foot. We ended up at the University where the toilets were filthy. To me that work was well worth while. I was only sorry that we had not provided ourselves with some cleaning powder so that we could make a really good job, and I was a little sad that the time allotted having expired we had to leave without disposing of the rubbish. These things show I still failed to understand the basic reason for these Gyogan expeditions, nor why on our return we should be greeted like saints before whom the elders bowed very humbly.

The last incident concerning Gyogan was a general meeting at which to decide arrangements for a Gyogan expedition for fifteen members at the end of November. Everyone was very serious and Takeko San, the business head of Inoue, read passages from *Tenko San's Life of Sango*, just as a parson would quote from the Bible. Others recalled previous expeditions and the inspiration that they had gathered from them. Finally it was decided that before this one there would be an all night vigil at St Kobo Temple's temple. On the date arranged for this, Takeko San, Ayako San, the only woman, and several of the young men left about 8 p.m. I was told they spent most of the night on discussing arrangements for the Gyogan expedition, meditated from about midnight until 2 a.m. and then slept until 6 a.m. when they returned to finish off their night's sleep under more comfortable conditions. It was of the Gyogan expedition that followed that my English pupil wrote saying how glad she was when anyone *did* let them clean the toilet.

I pondered over these Gyogan expeditions for several months after my return. What was the point of them? The natural inclination is to dismiss them as a joke. But one cannot do this. Tenko San had been a tremendous spiritual and moral force in Japan and his writings show profound wisdom and insight, and he had made Gyogan the core of his teaching. What is more, it is the core of the life, not only of fifteen members, but of the Koyakai, the lay disciples. On the 15th of each month the lay disciples dress in the uniform of the short black kim and the white head scarf, and an off + on distant place to "do Gyogan". These lay disciples include the heads of industrial undertakings, such as Noritake China, known throughout the world, as well as professional people and factory workers. Imagine the head of an English, let alone Indian, industrial concern, talking forth as a religious duty, far more important than going to church, to beg humbly for the favour of cleaning the toilet of an unknown house, and bowing gratefully whether permitted or refused. It is all very well to say that Japan is accustomed to monks and nuns going from house to house chanting sutras or asking for alms. This type of Japanese is now rare and I never saw such

And the fact that more often than not the supplicant is refused shows that Japanese people are no more accustomed to this sort of exorbitancy than Western people. It is humiliating to ask even when the request is granted and still more when refused. If the object were to clean dirty public toilets which badly needed cleaning, many people in the West could understand even though they refused to undertake such work themselves. But that is not the object. Most of the toilets are perfectly clean already, and there was no special merit in the good work we did at the University.

I was still puzzling over the apparently religious significance of Gyogan when I received two of Ayako San's letters, in each of which she described toilet-cleaning expeditions to distant places, how wonderful the experience and how happy she had been. She had felt she was with the Buddha and the saints. She liked this kind of "prayer" best of all. By prayer she obviously did not mean petitionary prayer as ordinarily understood, but rather the sense of oneness with God or seeing the Deities, as the Pure Texts put it.

I remembered the dedicated look on the faces of some of the lay people, especially the head of Nontake China Company, when they returned from toilet cleaning. I began to understand. I realized that true service can be given only when there is humility, absence of self and absence of consciousness of the usefulness of the work. The object of Gyogan would seem to be the cultivation of this prerequisite of all true service. Gyogan is a religious ceremony comparable to Holy Communion for the Christian, when the participant feels the member of Christ to the very core of his being, a love so sublime that it demands to give himself utterly to his Saviour. Anatta, the knowledge of selflessness in actual experience, lies at the centre of all religions, and religious understanding. Ceremonies and rituals come into existence as the outward expression of that inward quest. There is the further point that peace between people is only possible in so far as the sense of self-importance is given up. Hence the plea to be allowed to clean the honourable toilet for the sake of the peace of the world as well as our own self-abnegation.

It would seem that the most worthwhile work is that done in the spirit of these Gyogan expeditions. This is very different from the idea of most good, well-meaning people that the best work is that which helps others—we need not consider the popular idea that the best work is that which earns the most money! The trouble with this criterion of helpfulness is that we never know when we are doing good and helping others. The skillful doctor who saves the life of a child may have saved the life of a future murderer. In any case the results of the best work are always transient. The Emperor Asoka of India ruled his realm with the power of loving-kindness and good works, but the general peace

and well-being he brought into existence ended shortly after his death.

I thought of the work I had done during the two months at Inoue. Foremost was the completion of the book, *A New Road to Archaic Truth*, Makoto Uchida's translation of a part of Tenko San's *Life of Sango*, which I had put into idiomatic English. The most stimulating and delightful work had been teaching English conversation to the brightest senior school children. But the happiest, and now I come to think of it, the most valuable work, had been sweeping up the leaves from the pebbled paths and moss lawns under the wooded hills. That was the first job after breakfast ended at 6:30 a.m. Everyone who passed greeted me with a bright smile and hands prayerwise, and the tiny brooklet that ran at the foot of the hills seemed to smile equally brightly before it peered under a small stone bridge and fell into the little lake with gold fishes and a miniature island. I cannot honestly say I did this work in the spirit of the Gyogan prayer, for obviously everyone regarded it as a good work and I went up in their conviction by doing it. And also there were several objections to it, the need to put the drag heaven on a bonfire placed in exactly the right position for its smoke to blow over the laundry hanging out on bamboo poles, and far more serious than making the laundry dirty was the waste of good material that should have been composted. Near the end on looking back, the work of sweeping leaves—only to sweep more leaves again next day—seems to me the most significant. Why? Because it was an opportunity for meditating on the One Light, beyond all and in all, and the nothingness of my own self. It therefore contained at least some of the essential ingredients of *Gyogan*.

And that brings us to Takahata and Boto, the second most important matter in Inoue life. Takahata is Inoue's same name humble selfless service rendered without expectation of reward or thanks, but solely as an offering to Light out of gratitude for the opportunity of being able to help expiate the evils of the world. Now is the state of a beggar, homeless and penniless, and also far from the spiritual state of one not attached to knowledge, self-pride, worldly love or resentment.

As I have said, Inoue arose from the little band of people who gathered about Tenko San to do Takahata. They went along the roadside and asked at houses if they could do work without payment or reward of any kind. The original Inoue members had no home of their own. They lived in a continuous state of Boto, homeless and penniless as beggars. Inoue is very different nowadays. It owns land, buildings and other property, and the lives of its members are secure, for though none has any property of his own, each is given all that is necessary.

But as with *Gyogan*, so with Takahata—when the monks come for the monthly four days' training course, a Takahata expedition is the second item on the schedule. They go along the roadside in a state

of Roto, offering their services without payment. If lunch is given to them, well and good, if lunch is not given to them, that is also well and good. At least once a year a great many of Itosen's members go Roto for longer periods and to distant places.

The second month I was in Itosen, Ayako San took me with the Takahata expedition of the Hanazono. As we had not far to walk I was spared the embarrassment of requiring a taxi, although I was firing some shots over. It was raining. We stood for about half an hour in a line down the footpath beside the tiny brook and outside the Hall of Light, while we were told all about Takahata—at least I suppose that was what the lecture was about, but as it was in Japanese I was conscious only of the mud and an aching back. We then set off down the path and across the canal between the same avenue of Itosen members with hands prayerwise. We marched along the opposite bank to a Shinto shrine less than a mile away. The cotton oil paper umbrellas and short black kimonos looked most artistic in the misty light.

We stopped in front of the shrine to worship by clapping the hands twice and bowing, and then set off in different directions. Ayako San asked me if I preferred quiet houses or gay tea shops. Of course I preferred quiet houses. We tramped along for some time and then began knocking at the doors of the quiet houses. No one wanted us or our work. Either there was no one responsible at home, or they were indisposed or out. Then we tried a high class guest house, where they were clearing the breakfast after their guests had gone out for the day. A trustee had forestalled us, but there was work for us also, and we were taken into the large living room. My first impression was that it was already spotlessly clean. No one would have suspected that a large number of guests had eaten their evening meal and breakfast there sitting on cushions on the floor, still less that they had amused themselves in various ways during the evening. There was hardly a grain of rice and only two cigarette marks on the whole of that large spread of tatami matting. We stacked the cushions and wiped down the tatami matting with a damp rag, and likewise the polished boards and the sliding glass screens and the verandas beyond. I did the tops of the woodwork, which my superior height—5 feet 2 inches—could easily reach. We then went into the passages and did the same work. Finally I poked my way into a very back passage and removed the 'waken-drop' dust from the top ledges. I afterwards doubted whether the owners appreciated my intrusion into the dark recesses which no one sees, for I remembered hearing that the Japanese housewife is clean but not hygienic—like most Westerners for that matter!

Despite the body's unhappiness I had enjoyed doing something useful and no payment spoilt the pleasure.

After that we tried in vain to get more work. Ayako San said that

the gay quarter of the town with us is-there would have had plenty of work. But I was now finding a difficulty to drag one stride after the other and I simply could not walk further. I said I must go back. I sat on the damp ground beside the canal, relaxed and meditated and, walked back along the quiet waters. We picked up rubbish dropped by pedestrians. This seemed to me to be a good form of *Takuhatsu*, but as far as I could gather Ayako San did not regard it as of much merit. Perhaps she thought it was not rendering service to anyone in particular.

With my altogether mistaken criterion as to what work was worthwhile, I had found the best *Takuhatsu* was an expedition to Nagoya Castle before going to Innon when I accompanied the *Koyukai* or lay disciples. The management of Nagoya Castle, which is a tourist attraction, had contacted the secretary of the local *Koyukai* as to the possibility of their doing a little cleaning-up work. The picturesque castle is many stories high and can be seen a long way off. It is surrounded by the usual moat, but instead of water this is now filled with vegetable gardens. We met about fifty of the *Koyukai* outside the entrance, where we donned the white head-scarf with the circle of oneness, and then went in by another gate than the tourists. We had come together from various places around Nagoya city. Among us were Y I Ps, such as managers of large companies, and employees from their factories. I remember especially a young girl happy to come so that she could earn herself for marriage. In Australia, it would not be unusual for the company manager and a girl in the factory to meet at the same working bee, but in Japan the Y I Ps and the proletariats do not as a rule mix together, and the meeting here was significant. Our work consisted of clearing up rubbish and weeding footpaths. I thoroughly enjoyed gathering up the refuse and emptying rubbish-containers into a truck. This was really useful work. But I wished we had provided ourselves with something better than fingers for taking weeds out of the hard ground of the footpaths.

Work finished—or more correctly the allotted time having expired—we gathered together once again for some chatting and photographs. Because there was a foreigner with the *Koyukai*, a representative from the largest Nagoya newspaper had come to find out what Innon was about. She edited the weekly page on religion and was genuinely and sincerely interested. On the surface Japanese people have very little interest in religion except for weddings and funerals, but the largest paper can spare a whole page for any aspect of any religion the women in charge care to write about.

The gathering at Nagoya Castle was like that at a church or temple, but it was more than a ceremony for worship, more than a duty, and far more than the usual social gathering outside the church door after the service. Some, such as a farmer, had come a great distance. This farmer

had heard of Tenko San about twenty-five years before. He had a longing to find the ideal life and Itosen gave him what he sought. First or no times he attended the four days' training course. His life as a farmer did not alter, but its basis altered. He began to take an active part in serving his community, especially a youth group which he formed to promote better techniques in farming. The villagers came to trust him because they knew his one desire was to give service in the Itosen spirit.

I think that all who came carried over into their daily lives the spirit of service of their Takahata at Nagaya castle. But the one who impressed me most was the one I remember as 'the wedding dress man'. He was the secretary of the Nagaya Koyaku and easy to remember because of his bushy overhanging eyebrows. He had heard of Tenko San about forty years before when *Life of Sango* was first published. He was only twenty and wanted to join Itosen then and there. But his family would not hear of it. He therefore decided that, even though he was merely an employee, he would do his work in the Itosen spirit. When he married he and his wife opened a shop for selling kimonos and carried on the work in the same Itosen spirit. It started in a small way but grew rapidly. Then he conceived a brilliant idea as to how they might better serve their customers. The cost of the bride's kimono is crippling to her parents. How would it be if they could hire instead of buying? The hiring out of wedding attire, both Japanese and European, and the attire for the bride's and bridegroom's parents now became a large business. A few months before I was there he and all his staff went for the four days' Itosen training course in three consecutive months. While at Itosen they decided that thenceforth the day's work should be commenced with a short service of dedication. When I later viewed his premises he showed me the words they repeated. Ayako San later translated them.

May we be always thoughtful and industrious so that we help to create a better social order.

May we enjoy both our work and our fellowship with the other workers to the end that our cooperation create lasting happiness and prosperity.

May what we make be good and become more and more widely known to have benefited people, so that our work is helpful to society.

May we always have the spirit of humility and a consciousness of our responsibility for the evils of the world, and may our efforts express our gratitude for this opportunity (to help expiate the evils of the world).

We make these gowns with a sincere desire for the happiness of those who will wear them and so that the joyful brides may look both beautiful and noble.

Though our work may be exacting, our constant efforts for ongo-

reality show the worth of youthful aspiration.

It is a true teaching that guides us. Therefore in our daily work we shall be diligent and perform it with thanksgiving.

Because of the infinite Light that is given to us we live good and worthwhile lives.

I spoke with others of the Koyukai afterwards and they left me with no doubt as to the religious nature of these expeditions and that these lay disciples carried the same spirit into their every day business lives.

But I am not so sure that the same applies to the younger generation of Japan members who have all been born into the community, who have often not even read Tenko San's *Life of Sogye*, and hardly knew Tenko San in their childhood and youth. They therefore have little understanding of the homeless life of the early members. For them Gyogan and Takahata are like religious ceremonies from which the life has partly gone. When I asked the senior high school children what they thought about them, many replied, they liked them 'a little' or 'fifty-fifty'. They obviously had no idea of their inner meaning. But this applies to all religious ceremonies. That which was once alive and free becomes only half alive because it is fettered in form.

What emerges from an examination of Gyogan and Takahata is that no work has value in itself. Its value depends upon the spirit in which the work is done.

Who sweeps a room for Christ's sake

Makes that and the action live.

In other words the worthwhileness of work depends upon awareness of the worthwhileness both of the work and the worker, and the reality only of That which is not of the earth and remains entirely unaffected by the work done—a paradise, but life consists of' paradises.

One of the worst hindrances to working with this awareness is the interfering intellect, which prevents us thinking 'about it and about' instead of being merely aware. The work of the humble paragon remover may therefore be of more value than that of the learned priest, monk or layman who lectures on the teaching of the Buddha, Christ, Tenko-San or Gandhi. When we are engaged in easy mental work it is far easier to keep the mind fixed on Light or Krishna or God. Perhaps that is one reason why Aynko San found these Gyogan expeditions more satisfying than teaching English which is an intellectual occupation. Perhaps, too, that was one reason why Mahatma Gandhi insisted that body labour was necessary for all.

An even worse hindrance is the consciousness that we are doing good and helping people. Ananthapadika, the friend of the orphan and destitute and one of the Buddha's leading lay disciples, discovered that what really mattered was not his great benefactions but awareness of the transience of all he did to help the orphan and destitute. That

is the difficulty that begets all beneficent people. Unless they remember that the results of all the work they do will pass, they become puffed up with the good they do for others; when pride arises humility departs, and with it the ability to give any true service to anyone.

Humility is a difficult attitude to maintain, especially when one's work is successful or appears to be beneficial. That is the advantage of these Gyogan expeditions. It forces the suppliant to be humble. I cannot conceive of anyone being proud and self-important, especially when, after asking for the privilege of cleaning another person's toilet, he is refused. But also I cannot conceive of the method of forcing humility ever being employed in my own affluent country. The suppliant might not be handed over to the reception house for the insane, but he would certainly be regarded, like all evangelists who invade the privacy of our homes, as a public nuisance.

Expeditions to do manual work, such as we did at Nagoya castle, would not be impossible, but would not necessarily make for humility. They would, however, form a firm basis for a religious community among lay people who sought to follow Tonko San's teaching. But such religious gatherings would be of no more value than church services unless the spirit of humble selfless service, dedicated to Light, were carried over into everyday work. For when all attempts to do humble manual work have been exhausted, the fact remains that the most worthwhile work is that for which our nature fits us and which falls to our hands, when it is performed without thought of self, or thought of benefiting another but solely for Light—or God or Krishna—that is to say, for That which is beyond anything of this world.

**GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
CHECKLIST OF ENGLISH PUBLICATIONS**

1. Anantlal Mehra. **FREEDOM FROM FEAR**. Edited by T.K. Mahadevan. First edition 1948. 31 p. Paper. Rs 1. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
2. Richard B. Gregg. **I WANT A JOB OR WHAT CAN I DO?** First edition 1941. 36 p. Paper. Rs 0.50. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
3. J.B. Kripalani. **GANDHIAN THOUGHT**. First edition 1941. 281 p. Cloth. Rs 4.50. Calcutta: Orient Longman.
4. Symposium. **WHITHER INDIA?** First edition. 1942. 182 p. Paper. Rs 1. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
5. Padmini Walker and Maurice Brown. **TALKING OF GANDHI**. Paperback review, 1965. 84 p. Paper. Rs 1.50. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
6. T.K. Mahadevan, Adam Roberts and Gora Sharp. **CIVILIAN DEFENCE**. First edition 1957. 282 p. Cloth. Rs 12. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
7. G. Ramachandran and T.K. Mahadevan. **GANDHI: HIS RELEVANCE FOR OUR TIMES**. Second edition 1967. 282 p. Cloth. Rs 25. New Delhi: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
8. D.G. Tondkar. **ABOUT GHAFAR KHAN**. First edition 1951. 126 p. Cloth. Rs 60. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
9. G. Ramachandran and T.K. Mahadevan. **NONVIOLENCE AFTER GANDHI**. First edition 1958. 59 p. Paper. Rs 1. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
10. S. Radhakrishnan. **MAHATMA GANDHI. NO YEARS**. First edition 1948. 481 p. Cloth. Rs 17.50. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
11. Henryman Mander. **GREAT SOUL**. First Indian edition. 1949. 104 p. Paper. Rs 7.75. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
12. S. Abul Hasan. **GANDHI AND COMMUNAL UNITY**. First edition 1959. 151 p. Paper. Rs 4.75. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
13. B.L. Devdas. **SAGA OF SATYAGRAHA**. Revised new edition. 1949. 241 p. Cloth. Rs 9. Paper. Rs 7. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
14. Roy Walker. **WORD OF GOLD**. First edition 1949. 200 p. Cloth. Rs 12.50. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
15. K. Sankaranarayanan. **AN ANTHOLOGY OF INDIAN LITERATURES**. First edition 1949. 124 p. Cloth. Rs 30. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
16. Saradita Varma. **METAPHYSICAL FOUNDATION OF MAHATMA GANDHI'S THOUGHT**. First edition. 1979. 371 p. Cloth. Rs 1.50. Paper. Rs 5. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
17. T.K. Mahadevan. **TRUTH AND NONVIOLENCE**. First edition 1979. 400 p. Cloth. Rs 15. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
18. G. Ramachandran and T.K. Mahadevan. **QUEST FOR GANDHI**. First edition 1979. 451 p. Cloth. Rs 18. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
19. V.V. Ramana Murti. **GANDHI: ESSENTIAL WRITINGS**. First edition 1979. 476 p. Cloth. Rs 15. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
20. C.B. Dalal. **GANDHI 1913-1947: A DETAILED CHRONOLOGY**. First edition. 1971. 316 p. Cloth. Rs 16. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
21. Tik Chand. **LIQUOR MENACE IN INDIA**. First edition 1971. 124 p. Cloth. Rs 20. Paper. Rs 12. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
22. Prem Chopra. **THE SAGE IN REVOLT: A REMEMBRANCE**. First edition. 1972. 282 p. Cloth. Rs 26. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
23. Homer A. Jack. **RELIGION FOR PEACE**. First edition 1973. Cloth. Rs 13. Paper. Rs 9. Bombay: Bhambhani Vidyā Bhavan.
24. Sarita Rajagopal. **PILGRIM CENTENARY: A REMEMBRANCE**. First edition 1973. 317 p. Cloth. Rs 40. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Obtainable from

GANDHI BOOK HOUSE
Rajghat, New Delhi, 110029

Visit GUJARAT

Famous for its Cultural and Archaeological Heritage.

GIR - THE LAND OF LIONS -

Gir is a pre-historic home of the Indian Lion. In existence of 1875 by these lions are 25000. They can be seen in their natural habitat from very close quarters.



SUN TEMPLE - MODHERA - The early around Sun Temple at Modhera is a fine specimen of the superb craftsmanship of the Gujarat architects. The temple complex consisting of the Temple was constructed during the reign of of Chavda (1025-1150 AD) and was made in white and red stone (sandstone) of Gujarat.

SAPUTARA - A SILVAN BEAUTY OF GUJARAT -

Saputara is the second highest place in the Sahyadri range running through Gujarat State in order of green and dense forest of Deodar, there more or less 1260 feet.



For Detailed information please contact:

- (1) The Director of Information, Government of Gujarat, Sachdeviya, Block No. 8, Gandhinagar, (Near Ashoka) Tel: 224-444-447
- (2) Tourism Office, Ashoka Building, Near Rajendra Cinema, La Durang, Ahmedabad-1 Tel: 2475
- (3) Gujarat Information Centre, 4 Imperial Building, Town Hall, New Delhi Tel: 2626
- (4) Gujarat Government Tourism Office, Chhatrapati Shahu Road, Bombay Tel: 22777

IN BACK NUMBERS

1999

January

- William R. Miller : Gandhi and King—Pioneers of Modern Nonviolence
T.K. Mahadevan : An Approach to the Study of Gandhi
S. Varma : The Four Noble Truths of Gandhi's Social Philosophy

April

- A Controversy : The Meaning of Gandhi
Robert Payne : The Inheritance of Gandhi
Italo De Sola Pool : Violence in Villages
Saurit Nelson : Caste and Untouchability—and Gandhi

July

- R.R. Dinker : The Lokasamgraha and the Mahatma
Shubert Shuttacharya : Some Reflections on Gandhi the Writer
Cora Wynne-Tyson : Gandhi and the Goshalas
S. M. Tiwari : Four Questions on Gandhi's Philosophy

October

- Jayaprakash Narayan : Gandhi and Social Revolution
A.S. Deshpande : Gandhian Social Philosophy
Roselind Schama : The Obligations of the Individual
B. Lytle : Gandhi's Personality as a Source of his Influence

1998

January

- Donald H. Bishop : Gandhism and Dissent in America
George Luker : Strategy for Non-violent Revolution
James E. Bristol : The Draft Repeal Movement in the United States
Johanne Bosch : Erkkon's Gandhi

April

- T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Adulter of Mahatma Gandhi
K. G. Saiyidain : Gandhi's Lovable Personality
P. Rajaraja Rao : The Gandhian Concept of Dharma
Les Bowman : Totalitarianism or Nonviolence?

July

- Paul F. Power : Gandhi's View of Citizenship
R. Senthilam : Gandhi's Way of Life
R. R. Dinker : Dynamics of Ahimsa
Gene Sharp : Gandhi as a National Defence Strategist

October

- Grant Code : The Guna : 1914-1918
James D. Hunt : Thoreau and Gandhi : A Re-evaluation of the Legacy
T. K. Mahadevan : Gandhi Study in the Seventies
T.K.N. Unnikrishnan : Gandhian View of a World Social Order

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

IN BACK NUMBERS

1971

January

William L. Richter : Gandhi and Language : Political Relevance for the Seventies

Stuart Nelson : Nonviolence and India's Independence

Ije Lazar-Pawloski : Principles of Gandhi's Public Activity

April

James W. Douglass : The Revolution is the Kingdom

James Warren Gould : The Alternative to War

N. G. S. Kishor : Techniques and Taste of Gandhian Revolution

K. Guptaewer : Gandhi's Views on Law and Justice

July

Gerald Horwitz : The Idea of a Mass Nonviolent Movement

John Galtung : Peace Research

C. N. Patel : Erikson's Gandhi

V. V. Ramana Murthi : Gandhi and Nehru : Dialogue to Debate

October

Ramakrishna : Individualistic Trends in Gandhian Thought

Edwin King : Lohia and the U. S. Civil Rights Movement

Charles C. Walker : Nonviolent Action and the U. S. Navy

Ramakrishna Vengay : Gandhi and Technical Education

1972

January

G. Tucci : A Meditation on Gandhi
Donald H. Bishop : The Presuppositions of Nonviolence

Mansranjan Jha : Gandhi, Civil Disobedience and American Officials

R.S. Markandekar : The Theory of Resistance in Ancient India

April

Symposium : India After Bangle Dash

Homer A. Jack : The India-Pakistan Crisis of the U.N.

W. L. Gargan Jr. : Thoughts on the Road to Stockholm

Marie B. Dylke : Moral Basis of Violence and Nonviolence

July

Lewis Mumford : The Pentagon of Power

James Warren Gould : The Future of Nonviolence in Social Change

R. R. Dikshitar : Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy : Its Universality

James W. Douglass : The Yin-Yang of Resistance and Contemplation

October

Maurice Friedman : The Community of Otherness and the Covenant of Peace

James E. Bristol : Nonviolence not First for Export

James J. Preston : Religion and Political Process in Gandhi and Tolstoy

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

REGD. NO. 10/1944/1 PUBLISHERS' AND PRINTERS' CENTRAL EXCISE LICENCE
NO. 10/1944-75.



17/3

VOL. 17 . No. 3 . JULY . 1973.

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

GANDHI
MARGSHATTACHARYYA / CHAUDHURI / DAS / DAS-
GUPTA / JOHN / KRIPALANI / MAJUMDAR / MAL-
KANI / MEADOWS / MISRA / MODY / MUKERJEE / NAM-
BOODIRIPAD / NARAYAN / NARLA / RANGA / SHAH /
SUBRAMANYAM / THAPAR / TRIPATHI / WALLACE

IN BACK NUMBERS

1967

January

V. S. Narayana : Some Reflections on Optimism
William Robert Miller : Violence and the Christian Ethic
Josephine Holcomb : Gandhi at the Round Table Conference
P. Nagaraja Rao : Gandhi and the Hindu Concept of Atmava

April

Thomas Merton : Terror and the Absurd
Theodor Ebert : The Meaning of Nonviolent Resistance
Jerry Swackil : The Perspectives of Peace Research
Horace Alexander : Ends and Means in the Pursuit of Peace

July

Martin Luther King : The Casualties of the War in Vietnam
John R. Rees : The Concept of Deterrence
R. R. Diwakar : Gandhi and Man in Evolution
Theodor Ebert : Nonviolence : Doctrine or Technique?

October

J. B. Kripalani : The Meaning of Swadeshi
Donald H. Bishop : Gandhi and the Concept of Love
Karen Monson and Martin Grotjohn : Racial Prejudice and the Incest Taboo
T. V. Parvati : Talk and Gandhi

1968

January

Martin Luther King : The Crisis in America's Cities
Marie B. Byles : Truth is God
Jayaprakash Narayan : The Outlook for Peace in India
Ralph David Assenseth : Religion and World Peace

April

Robert Steele : The American Dream Becomes a Nightmare
Bo Winmark : The Changing Ideology of Nonviolence
T.R. Mahadevan : Democracy and the New Generation
Norm Chomsky : The Revolutionary Pacifism of A. J. Muste

July

Maurice Friedman, Martin Luther King: An American Gandhi and a Modern Job
Melford Q. Spaley : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Revolution
Stuart Nelson : Black Power and the Poor People's Campaign
Adam Roberts : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Resistance

October

James W. Douglass : Is there a Politics without Violence ?
Geoffrey Ashe : Can Nonviolence Change Society?
H.J.N. Horsburgh : Nonviolence and Impatience
R. R. Diwakar : Truth and Nonviolence : New Dimensions

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

GANDHI MARG 66

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME SEVENTEEN- NUMBER THREE JULY 1979

Editors

G. Ramachandras

T. K. Mahadevan

Editorial Board

R. R. Diwaker

J. B. Kripalani

Jayaprakash Narayan

Abid Hussain

Vijaya Hari

G. Ramachandras

Shrinivas Narayan

Bhavani Prasad Misra

Radhakrishna

Devendra Kumar Gupta

T. K. Mahadevan (Corresponder)

Contents

Editorials	179	Politics of service versus politics of power
	182	Beyond democracy and socialism
Symposium	184	Democracy, socialism—and Gandhi
Dennis L. Meadows	217	The Equilibrium State
Michael D. Wallace	226	Peace research: the radical critique
A Bibliography	261	Looking into the future, 1950-1970

II ISSN 0814-4437

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CARD NO. 58-47534

Rs. 1.50 a year in South Asia; \$ 1.50 elsewhere: postfree. Rs. 3.00 (\$ 1.50) the copy. Payment in advance. Publication dates: 15 Jan., 15 Apr., 15 Jul., 15 Oct. Complaints about non-receipt: (inland) within 15 days; (foreign) within 45 days. Remittances by bank drafts or postal or money orders only. Published by T. K. Mahadevan for the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 311/321 Doot Bopal Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi 110 081 and printed by him at the Kaveri Printing Press, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi-110 022.

Editorials

POLITICS OF SERVICE VERSUS POLITICS OF POWER

It has been said that even good men and women remember God only in times of adversity and forget Him when the going is good. Such an attitude can be criticized as opportunistic. If we look at this a little more kindly it can well appear somewhat natural. When life is happy and carefree divine providence becomes unimportant in life. It is irrelevant even if not apparent. When individuals and groups face tragedies and travail they cry out to God for protection and support. This is because God is the refuge of those beaten down and in suffering. This explanation is not meant to defend any opportunistic attitude in this regard. It is just an explanation of a human problem.

In the early years of Indian independence, with Mahatma Gandhi gone, people in their exuberance of new-found freedom went nearly on forgetting the Master. There also came occasions when we not only deviated from the path he had indicated but even took pride in thinking that some of us were wiser than him. We do not wish to quarrel with what happened. When tragedies occurred and we were confronted with growing violence all around and the deepening of the gulf between the haves and have-nots, the memory of the Master began creeping back into our minds. We passed through moments of introspection. These were, however, short and fleeting and we sank back into renewed forgetfulness. This happened often in the last 25 years. But more than anyone else, two of India's greatest men after Gandhi, again and again recalled us to the basic values which had flowed from the life, work and death of Gandhi. These were Pandit Nehru and Acharya Vinoba. Their fields of action were utterly different from each other. But what they did was inimitable and in essence complementary. Pandit Nehru was the Prime Minister, concerned with government, the functions of government and, in spite of all difficulties, with finding for India a place in the modern world. Acharya Vinoba turned away completely from government and applied the strategy of nonviolence in a crucial field of economic trans-

formation, i.e. the voluntary redistribution of land among the landless millions. Land hunger has been at the root of many revolutions in the world and if India has not had a blood bath in this regard, we must bow our heads in reverence to that gentler of our sages who walked from one end of India to the other meeting millions of people face to face and pleading that those who had more land should part with some of it voluntarily to those who had no land at all. In any other country in the world such a silent revolution through consent would have been hailed as one of the miracles of history and any nation would have been proud of whatever was achieved in this regard. And yet the Bloodless-Revolution did not achieve its aim and became riddled with divisions and errors. Pandit Nehru, on the other hand, tried valiantly to build up an image of India still reflecting the moral and spiritual values of Gandhi in Indian politics, and at the same time to modernise the country. Pandit Nehru's herculean endeavour to rebuild Indian politics on such a firm and moral foundation achieved only partial success. Very few people have the capacity to consider the night-before-yests of history. In the present case very few people are capable of thinking what would have happened in India without the vital and complementary leadership of both Acharya Vinoba and Pandit Nehru. People who just do nothing or have completely failed in the Gandhian tasks they had undertaken, can easily throw stones at both Vinoba and Nehru. But this will not touch their essential greatness which will remain enshrined in history.

It is against this background that we shall make an attempt to assess some of the matters which confront India. The first thing that strikes like a terrific blow on our minds is the crisis of character which has overtaken almost every section of our people. The politician, the government servant, the industrialist, the labourer, the peasant and even the social and constructive worker have all come under this blight. It is enough to say that in the history of a nation the rise and fall of character follow like waves, one after the other, with imperative frequency. This will be poor consolation. Even at high levels, Indian politics has become terribly corrupt and shamelessly opportunistic. Political leaders who held on to vital foundations of moral values are still there on the Indian scene but they are few and far between. They have, however, failed to inhibit their followers with their own sense of integrity. What has happened in Andhra, in Bihar, in U.P. and Gujarat, are tragic reminders that political opportunism has infected all levels of the Congress. The Gandhian era in Indian politics was almost wholly one of the politics of service. Even if Gandhi did not use the picturesque and magnificent phrases of Winston Churchill, he also made it clear that his politics were those of sweat, toil and suffering. He had nothing to offer to those who stood with him except the prison and the bullet—and yet

millions talked to his trumpet call, recking no consequence too dear in facing every challenge of brutality from the British who held India in subjection. Today politics has miserably become carrot-chasing by those greedy for any crumbs of power or money. There are many constitutional steps that can be taken to minimise political opportunism and chicanery. As for instance, the proposed legislation to prevent elected members from crossing the floor by making it imperative that such people should resign and seek a fresh verdict from the electorate. No member of any legislature crossing the floor should be rewarded with high office of any kind. We should make it clear beyond doubt that the nation will treat with contempt such 'ayazim and gyaanims'. Most of our political corruption stems from this basic depravity of those seeking power or money at any cost. It is not enough that our leaders furnish political leadership. They must also furnish moral leadership which the people will instinctively understand and value. There are only very few persons in the Congress today so hard up real mass contact and revealing to the people the challenges of social and constructive service. The political machinery is almost wholly that of vote-catching. When any political party reduces itself to a vote-catching machine it is a doomed party. While thus on the one hand political leaders of all parties have turned away from social and constructive work, constructive workers on the other hand have turned away completely from all political action. Both these attitudes are fatal. A way must be found to combine political and constructive work, taking all the necessary safeguards to prevent such unity of action degrading itself in the manner of present-day politics. On the one hand, we subject political leaders to every kind of inquisition and on the other let them play the devil with character and money. This is a strange paradox. On the one hand we attempt character examinations and on the other let many an evil deer get off with it. To completely divorce social and constructive work from political work is to hand over power to charlatans.

There are many other relevant matters to which one can refer. But we wish to stress in this essay the paramount need to face up to the present grave and alarming crisis of character. There are no easy remedies. Everyone must re-emphasise the politics of service without treating politics itself as dirt. Politics is only as dirty as we make it. The politics of Gandhi, Nehru, Sardar Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Chattampi Das, Lajpatra and Rajas were not dirty politics but something which elevated and purified politics. Gandhi daringly used the phrase 'spiritualising politics', something unheard of till he arrived on the political scene. Some of our best leaders even while in politics must set the example of simple and high living and give genuine moral leadership. Authentic political leaders should join hands with authentic social and constructive

workers standing for truth and nonviolence in every sphere of action. We must rouse the people once again to bring together political action and service action, into an integrated national movement. It is not easy to draw up the blueprint of such a program. It is for us all however to give thought to this matter, confer together and arrive at high-minded and practical solutions.

© RAMACHANDRAN

BEYOND DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

It is amazing how few of us understand the political implications of the technological revolution. International fetish words like *democracy* and *socialism* still sway our minds. Ideological fetters (using that word in the cinematic sense) still hold us in thrall. It's as though, for us, the world has come to a stand-still and all we need do is ring changes upon old and well-trodden themes!

The Symposium that follows this article is an attempt to jerk ourselves out of set grooves of thinking. Alas, the attempt has not proved an unqualified success. And the conviction has grown upon us that what this century needs most of all is a large measure of iconoclasm and heresy. Far too many sacred cows crowd upon our mental horizons, inhibiting and thwarting the natural impulse to truth and freedom. This is a calamity even more calamitous than the scarcities—food, water, power, jobs, houses, schools, hospitals (the list is endless)—and the warlike (like too many people and too many politicians!) that punctuate the staccato rhythm of our national life.

To anyone who is alive to the meaning of this last third of the twentieth century and is able to use his intellectual antennae to good purpose, democracy and socialism are no longer even the convenient pegs they once were. They are rather like the mantras that characterize a mind at the end of its tether or the revolutionary twitches that mark a deteriorating physique. As the tidal waves of the technological revolution engulf and overwhelm every commanding height of our political existence—and not even a King Canute can hope to command these waves!—they will wash away many things. Amidst the debris, as in past historic inundations, one will not have to search hard to find the remains of such ideology-turned-fetters as democracy and socialism.

The shape of things to come is already writ large everywhere. But there is such a thing as doctrinal myopia. We see and yet we do not perceive! Perhaps it is human, all too human, to cling to old illusions, to

imagine that somewhere in the past—which may be as recent as Marx or Mao or Gandhi or as ancient as Aristotle or Kapilya—we reached the final watershed of our thinking, and all we need do now is work out the details of that vision. This would indeed be true—too easily true—had the world not displayed a persistent and somewhat cantankerous tendency to change without warning. And this time—and we are not talking here of Buddhist metaphysics!—the sharpest reality is an otherwise blurred and out-of-focus world. It is our only beacon.

Technology is duly making nonsense of ideological postures, whether of the high-key or the low-key variety. In the thesis for the Symposium we have suggested a neutral-ground position that ventures to look beyond the familiar pulls and pushes of ideology. We thought we were in Gandhi a deep sensing of the natural evolution of man's collective political personality. We will not claim that he had worked out anything in very great detail, but he did show a remarkable awareness of the direction in which man must perforce travel if he is not to destroy himself too soon.

We lament that this direction is still so little understood in our country and that the incubation of ideology is taking us to a dead-end. In past ages, when time was more generous, one could learn things the hard way. Do we now have the time for such costly detours?

Why minor words? The world-wide trend towards autocracy and totalitarianism—of one hue or another, student or camouflaged—is unmistakable. For one ideology can breed only another ideology. And the two poles of any ideological spectrum look strangely alike! The obvious way out is to escape from the clutches of this fixed-back loop (as the computer jargon has it) and examine with a fresh pair of eyes the simple ingredients that make for good government—in the ultimate analysis, good *any* government. This is far, far beyond both democracy and socialism—or any combination of these—and goes to the roots of human ideology.

T. K. MANDIRAN

Democracy, socialism —and Gandhi

A SYMPOSIUM

B. BHATTACHARYYA
TRIDHA CHAUDHURI
ASHUTAMANDA DAS
D. N. DAS GUPTA
V. V. JOSE
A. B. KRIPALANI
B. G. MAHENDAR
K. B. MALIKANI
S. N. MEHA

HUDD HODD
HIRSH HODDERJEE
E. M. S. RAMAKRISHNAPAD
SRISMAN SARAYAN
V. S. SARELA
M. G. SANGH
A. B. SHAN
RAHASI SUBRAMANYAM
SOMESH THAPAR

THE THESIS

- ☐ Ever since independence, India has been riding two horses at one and the same time—democracy and socialism. This equestrian feat has had its ups and downs. By and large, however, it's the democratic horse that had stolen the show, earning for us the not too enviable reputation of being the 'largest' democracy in the world. The socialist horse, with its torso relatively ill-defined, lurped behind.
- ☐ Lately all this has changed. The new Government, with a new rigging philosophy and determined to get teeth into its socialism, has begun willy nilly to nibble away at democracy, in the process raising a commotion in the house. It's now the democratic horse that's limping behind. Waddly awakened from 25 years of torpor eating, we panic at the sight.
- ☐ The moral is clear. Surprisingly, however, few in our country have shown signs of understanding it. Democracy and socialism are in-

comparables—however much we may juggle with catch-phrases like 'democratic socialism' and 'socialist democracy'. They cannot co-exist without the one crowding into the other. They cannot be blended into one concoction except in a highly diluted form.

- If we want full-blooded socialism—any other socialism is a hoax anyway—we must be willing to make deep compromises with our democratic inheritance. On the other hand, if we want to keep our democracy unaltered—indeed, make it much more of a living thing—we must be willing to give up our socialist experiment. We just can't bestride both the horses without sooner or later falling off our perch and exposing ourselves to universal ridicule.
- That is indeed a India's present and continuing dilemma. All the rest of the argument—independent judiciary, free press and what not—is wide of the mark.
- Gandhi perceived this dilemma long ago when he put forward the trans-ideological alternative. He was a man who swore neither by democracy nor by socialism, being, at best, a half-hearted democrat and a reluctant socialist. Taking doctrinaire positions was not his idea of nation building. Gandhi's 'truth'—the basis of his political philosophy—was no dogma but the substance that responds creatively to changing reality.
- Which way then shall India steer her ship of state? Towards socialism? Towards democracy? Or shall we avoid both Scylla and Charybdis and give Gandhi's trans-ideological alternative a second look?

T. K. MARATHAN

THE DEBATE

Buddhadevi Bhattacharyya

The alternatives are not democracy and socialism. The historic choice before us today is: capitalism or socialism? Any student of contemporary Indian polity may probably ask himself one question, namely, *why*? What is the class which benefited most from the political transformation in August 1947? Who constitute the ruling class in the sovereign democratic republic of India?

The Indian state is a capitalist state. Espousing the principles of private property, the Government promotes the nation socialism. The political system developed during last twenty-five years does not respond to the hopes and aspirations of the masses of our people. The country is nowhere near realising the humanitarian dreams of Gandhi, not only

because it is not possible to reverse the process of history, but also because the humanism urges that lay behind Gandhi's utopia did never appeal to the powers that be.

The Constitution, by guaranteeing bourgeois property rights, acquired the character of a bourgeois constitution. And the state, elaborated in harmony with the basic principle of the Constitution, logically became a bourgeois state.

One should not ignore the basic social truth that the economic and political life of capitalist societies is *primarily* determined by the relationship, born of the capitalist mode of production, between the class on the one hand which owns and controls and the working class and toiling masses on the other. In fact, the political process in capitalist societies is mainly about the confrontation of these forces, and is intended to sanction the relationship between them. And India is no exception to this general pattern.

India opted for a political form familiarly described as simply 'democratic', which in essence is 'bourgeois democratic'. Democracy is not static, uniform or fixed but a *dynamic*, diversified, changing product of socio-economic development. Hence the need for qualifying the democratic form by its essential social content.

Whatever its merits, bourgeois democracy does not give the decision-making powers to the majority but functions as a screen for the domination of capital.

Contemporary capitalism has been betraying all the features of liberal democracy. And Indian capitalism being a part of international capitalism, and more so because of the compulsions of its under-developed (graphematically called developing) nature, is on the way to manipulating its democratic forms. As a matter of fact, democracy has been honoured more in its violation than in its protection and expansion. The democracy of the past was tied up with the advancement of capitalism. Now that its achievements are threatened by the retrogression of capitalism, the prospects of democracy are inseparably linked to the struggle for socialist revolution which will bring the masses to power.

Revolutionary socialism and genuine democracy are not disjunctive propositions. The question is not that of making a choice between democracy and socialism but that of replacing the existing system by a superior type of democracy which will enable the producers of wealth to control their lives and livelihoods and expand their freedoms. That can only be a socialist democracy in the authentic sense of the term, and not, of course, in its Stalinist-bureaucratic perverted version.

Tridib Chaudhuri

The apparent dichotomy between democracy and socialism and their

mutual exclusiveness have their origin in our habit of understanding democracy in terms of 'bourgeois' democracy. 'Bourgeois' democracy implies a concept of politics based on certain inalienable democratic rights for the citizen which, however, do not transgress the absolute limits set by the rights of private property. Other fundamental rights, rights of personal freedom, freedom of conscience, rights to free expression (freedom of press and speech), freedom of movement, assembly and profession, the right of every citizen to secure lawful redress against any violation of these guaranteed rights in a court of law, the so-called independence of the judiciary, equality of all citizens before the eyes of the law etc., all follow from and revolve round the sacrosanct and inalienable right of private property. The owner of private property cannot be deprived of his property or disturbed in the pursuit of lawfully augmenting his property—that is the fundamental principle of 'bourgeois' democracy, except for such violations or partial violations of that principle as are called for in the collective interest of the class of private property owners as such.

But it does not at all imply that every citizen is a property-owner. The right to own and dispose of one's property as one likes is a right guaranteed only for owners of property. Propertyless people, the have-nots, do not have that right. But they have other rights, the freedom of opinion and expression, the right to vote for electing their representatives to the legislature, right to a representative and responsible government (responsible, that is, to their elected representatives) and so on. But they do not have any legally guaranteed right to work, employment and adequate livelihood. The directive principles of state policy in the Indian Constitution declare these things to be desiderata. But they are not legally enforceable. Bourgeois democracy as ordinarily understood is based on the freedom of the individual and that of the individual property-owner. It does not protect or guarantee the rights of employment or livelihood. But it invariably protects the rights of property-owning citizens to own, augment, enjoy and dispose of their property. The fundamental right of private property naturally includes the right to inherit and bequeath property as well as dispose of it by sale or gift. No one, neither private persons nor the state, can deprive the property-owning citizen of that right. The logical consequences following from this have taken shape in the acquisitive society of modern capitalist democracies.

As private property exists in the so-called democratic societies of our day in the dominant form of capitalist private property and as the modern acquisitive society, based on capitalist private property and industrial technology, requires a considerable degree of regulation and mutual adjustment of interests between competitive capitalist groups (within the country as well as outside), the need to curb and even transgress the rights of some owners of property, in order to safeguard the

collective interest of all or the majority of private property owners (particularly those of the dominant sections), has come to be recognised as an unavoidable necessity in all modern capitalist democracies these days. These restrictions or curbs take the form of state capitalism or, to use the Leninist terminology, state monopoly capitalism.

Modern socialism, call it 'full-blooded' socialism if you like, primarily implies a five-fold principle of social organisation which basically contradicts the 'bourgeois' concept of democracy, viz. (1) a negation of the sacrosanctness (i.e. of the inviolability) of the right of private property; (2) the principle of collective social ownership of all sources of wealth and production through the state or otherwise (through other forms of collective or cooperative social organisations), (3) planned social production for the satisfaction of social needs instead of private profit; (4) recognition of the principle that nobody shall be entitled to a share of social wealth or to an enjoyment thereof, as of right, by virtue of his private ownership of the means of production without taking part in socially necessary labour (cf. the Biblical principle: 'He who shall not work, neither shall he eat'), and lastly (5) effective democratic control over the state and over the collective organs of society by the common citizens (all of whom would be 'citizen-workers' who would actively participate in the process of social labour according to their capacity).

The apparent contradiction between democracy (as traditionally understood) and socialism with which we are confronted today cannot be resolved if, in the first place, we are not prepared to free our notion of democracy from its visible and invisible moorings in private property. The new Congress Government under the leadership of Mrs Gandhi has been intensely caught in the web of this contradiction because of the inhibitions placed on its mode of thinking by the traditional concept of democracy based on private property. We must not forget that the sacrosanctness of the rights of private property is recognised as an inalienable fundamental right in the basic law of the land, namely, the Constitution of India. Recent amendments of the Constitution made by the new Parliament have not changed the position in that regard except modifying the legal right to receive compensation at the market rate for private property taken over by the State. The latest Supreme Court decisions in constitutional amendment cases (25th and 26th amendments) have again reinforced the inalienable character of the rights of private property and the Government is bound by it. But that apart, the Prime Minister has repeatedly declared that neither she nor her Government has any intention to abolish private property or its rights, they only seek to restrict it, where required, for subserving the common good. Obviously they have failed to make up their mind as to how much of socialism and how much of democracy they want to realise, they wear by both.

As a result the Government wobbles between its vote-catching popu-

but slogans about democracy and socialism without ensuring and practising either consistently. What it actually practises inevitably tends to degenerate into selling state monopoly-capitalism over certain vital strategic sectors of the national economy in the name of socialism. Really speaking, its policies do not have the remotest connection with authentic socialism while at every step it goes on violating even the formal rule of bourgeois democracy about individual freedom and civic liberties in the interest of its authoritarian one-party rule, which eventually serves to promote the interest of a favoured group of capitalists and monopolists.

Those who believe in the basic human values represented by democracy should, in the first place, try to formulate a truly democratic structure of society unshackled in any manner by the restrictions of private property. The concept of democracy, based on the ideas of essential human freedom (as embodied in the inalienable civic freedoms of person, opinion and expression, freedom of movement, freedom to seek legal redress for one's rights, independence of judiciary etc.) and sanctity of the human personality, can be immeasurably enriched if it is rid of its traditional association with the rights of private property as these have developed historically over last three centuries.

The elimination of the right of private property as a fundamental right does not mean that all private property has to be abolished or liquidated at a stroke. Such forms of private property as small-peasant property or the property of self-employed persons in industry or that of small owners employing a limited number of workers, may be permitted till such time as the society (i.e. the state) is ready to bring them under appropriate forms of collective or cooperative social organization, if these subserve the common good. The criterion here is entirely pragmatic, based on practical or empirical considerations. If any form of private property is allowed to exist for some time, it must not be at the expense of basic human values or transgress the democratic rights of the common man, the common-worker.

Here it is that Gandhi's non-doctrinaire and empirical humanistic approach can help us immensely. I dislike describing Gandhi's approach as 'trans-ideological'. I have always understood Gandhism as *essentially humanistic*, based on the recognition of the sacredness of the human personality and his concept of democratic freedom as the essential precondition under which the human personality can attain its fullest development. As to his method, it is the purely practical or empirical one of securing human freedom and the fulfilment of the human personality, which were his categorical imperatives. I see no reason why this approach should be inhibited or bound in any manner by ingrained notions about the irrevocability of private property. If Gandhi never brought himself consciously to deny the rights of private property and

ever wanted the capitalists as a class to regard themselves as 'castes' for the labourers and the poor, it is equally true that he never regarded the rights of property or wealth to be inviolable. That to my mind is the superiority of his empirical humanist approach.

Gandhi's is surely not the historical or sociological approach of the class-struggle socialist. But it is by no means 'trans-ideological'. It follows from the basic ideology of eternal humanism and furnishes the unerring guideline for Gandhi's 'truth'. Regarded from this point of view Gandhi's approach can help us to resolve the current contradiction between the notions of democracy and socialism. But it will require a radical departure from the traditionally accepted notions of democracy and socialism.

I for one see no reason why socialism should contradict democracy or vice versa. As a matter of fact there can be no socialism without democracy, as Lenin said, provided that we do not equate democracy with private property. Gandhi's basic humanism would help us to salvage democracy from its traditional association with private property, to realize authentic humanist democracy on the higher plane of socialism and, last but not the least, to humanize socialism and rid it of the vice of totalitarian collectivism which seeks to crush and pulverize the human individual and its uniqueness.

Amritananda Das

It has been my feeling, for quite some time now, that it is misleading to concern the dilemmas of practical policy facing this country as a choice between 'socialism' and 'democracy'. The reason for this feeling is that both 'socialism' and 'democracy' are second-order goals, i.e., they are not ends in themselves but seek to realize certain ideals. Clarity of thinking is promoted by concentrating on these fundamental ideals rather than on the secondary goals of socialism and democracy.

Primarily, to my mind, 'socialism' is valued as a tool for realizing a non-exploitative (fraternal) society in which economic power is not used to the public detriment. Similarly, when we talk of 'democracy' what we really wish to secure is the responsiveness of public policy to mass opinion and the protection of the fundamental rights of the individual. Consequently, the three fundamental goals on which we need to concentrate are:

- A. protection of the fundamental rights of the individual,
- B. responsiveness of public policy to mass opinion; and
- C. laying the foundations of a non-exploitative socio-economic order.

Once we visualize our goals as above, the following things become quite clear. First, by setting up a highly centralized politico-administrative

new system we have put public policy effectively beyond the reach of the people. It is only through restructuring the politico-administrative order on the basis of rigorous decentralisation that the popular will can be given a chance to manifest itself.

Secondly, the same tendency towards centralised administration of the ordinary business of life of the citizenry inevitably creates a milieu in which *more and more arbitrary power* is demanded by the administration in order to discharge effectively the *duties which have been assigned to it*. Under such a condition, there can be no serious attempt to protect the fundamental rights of the individual.

Finally, we have adopted an elitist scheme of development based on the unrealistic hope of material affluence on a mass basis. The actual operation of this modernisation-industrialisation drive is to merely strengthen the hands of the elite and to put into their hands more and more power to exploit the 'mass'.

The remedy is obvious. We must orient our development strategy towards a post-modern society and recognise that such a society will be based on the ideal of need limitation, equal sharing, small use of operations and a stress on eco-technic balance. Once these aims are fully accepted the need for centralisation of economic and political power will disappear. It will then be possible to fully implement the ideal of communitarian democracy within a broad national legal framework guaranteeing fundamental rights to the individual.

It, therefore, appears that the basic ideals which socialism and democracy stand for are being destroyed in this country because we are concentrating on outer form and not inner essence. These same ideals can be simultaneously pursued only on the basis of the thorough acceptance of:

- A. a decentralised political order based on communitarian democracy,
- B. commitment towards a post-modern socio-economic order based on need limitation, ecological balance and appropriate (sane) technology, and
- C. a realisation that the pursuit of power-centralisation in the hands of the administration is incompatible with the maintenance of the liberty of the individual.

As will be amply clear, these insights are also fundamentally the same as those which Gandhi had attained. In this sense it remains true that only an understanding of Gandhi's thought can rescue us from the present confusions and traps errors.

D N. Dangi

Those who declare that democracy is incompatible with socialism may

ask themselves a question: Is democracy compatible with the latest false theory that that government is best which governs the least? Is the state to be only a policeman to protect the bank vaults and keep the burglars away? The marriage between democracy and capitalism has never been pleasant, contrary to the belief of those who grope at the very margins of socialism.

Socialist measures—I believe there are quite a number of them to be distinguished from full-blooded socialism and all of which involve greater intervention by the state in the economic sphere—have to be seen as the necessary deterrents to check wayward capitalism. Keynes was no socialist, but he knew that democracy cannot survive, not to speak of thriving, if social welfare measures are not undertaken by the state, if public finance is not given more place in the economic life. The Great Depression of 1929 killed the myth that capital has its own checks and controls. Roosevelt was no socialist, but he was a democrat who made adjustments with the post-depression economics and brought in the New Deal.

I think the mistake occurs when we assume that democracy is the political version of free enterprise. Democracy as a way of life, as a pattern of thinking, is wide enough to encompass a great variety of economic theories. That alone explains why Mao insists on calling his adaptation of Leninism New Democracy. Many sociologists have described the Cultural Revolution as an experiment in mass democracy. Similarly, democratic socialism is not an empty shell-epoch, but a viable and significant step towards finding a balance between the individual and society, between freedom and coercion. Those who decry state interference in industry—from the Industrial Policy announcement in 1956 to the current take-over of food-grains trade—may as well ask why the U.S. Government undertook anti-monopoly legislation (the Taft Act) in the 'thirties or why the Federal Bank in that country is run by the Government. All the more reason why our economy, which still lacks the vigour and glow of risk-taking, adventurous capitalism, should call for state direction.

The crux of the matter is that if we cannot manage to bring together democracy and socialism, if, through legislative and peaceful means, we cannot remove the evils of economic disparity and concentration of social power, the alternative will not be out-throat capitalism but what Mr Mahadevan calls full-blooded socialism.

Then quite a lot of blood is likely to flow, quite a number of heads are likely to roll. This is no nightmarish fancy, but a real possibility. The vast majority of Indians are impatient with a system that consistently cheats them of even a meal a day. Full-blooded socialism is likely to fascinate them. Democrats have to see to it that their dignity is shared by all others. So the process of socialism, I

think, should be hastened and not slowed down. Time is running out.

One word about Gandhi's position vis-a-vis the debate. Gandhi's economic thought, it is no use denying, was determined by the colonial status of India and its present relevance is a matter of dispute. Decentralisation, accent on a self-sufficient village economy and disregard of industrialisation do not add up to a viable economic system for an underdeveloped country in desperate need of reconstruction. And the Gandhian concept of a trusteeship of capitalists has been betrayed by that class, who do not even clear their income tax data. It is their collectivism, their absolute unconcern, their conspicuous display of wealth and vulgarity that invite state control. The commanding heights of the economy, it is justifiably felt, cannot any more be left to their control.

P. V. John

One way to discuss the problems of our polity is to deal with them in terms of the concentration or distribution of power, political, economic and social.

Lincoln's designation of democracy as government of the people, by the people, for the people, is perennially valid; it indicated the source of authority in the democratic state and the objectives of the exercise of that authority. It is however necessary to add that it is of the essence of the democratic faith that there should be no concentration of power, political, economic or social, in any agency or group or person in the state, not even in a majority of the citizens. In other words, democracy attempts the delicate and difficult task of seeking the common good, through reconciling the will of a majority of the people with the inalienable rights of the individual, such as are invoked in the opening lines of the Indian Constitution, namely, justice, freedom and equality.

In regard to the quality of its judgement, a democracy may claim no more than that 'more than half of the people are right more than half of the time'. A system based on so modest a claim would provide for freedom of dissent, and would be clearheaded enough to acknowledge the lesson of history that great ideas almost invariably begin as minority ideas, and the welfare of the human race has often depended on the chances these ideas have had of winning due attention.

It is one of the wonders of democratic life that the secret of freedom sometimes emerge not only from among a minority of ideologues, who but for the freedom they demand would themselves suffer persecution, unless they plan to do the persecution themselves. In the face of widespread poverty and suffering, we are asked to choose economic well-being in preference to a freedom that amounts to no more than the freedom of the many to starve and of a few to exploit. In situations

of despotism, it is not easy for people to see that those who surrender freedom in the search for economic security may end by having neither freedom nor security. A benevolent tyranny might conceivably provide economic security, but neither the benevolence nor the security is guaranteed over any length of time. And when the security vanishes, or even fails to arrive, the trustful people who surrendered freedom in the expectation of economic well-being, are left with no resource other than rebellion or assassination. Democracy, which sometimes covers the efficiency that despotism achieves in the pursuit of desirable objectives, has one supreme quality that despotism does not have, a quality that puts it above other patterns of governance, namely, the capacity for self-correction. This process is often slow and may drive people to despair. One of the tasks of democracy is to speed up this self-correcting process.

There are two widely divergent concepts of socialism that have both found adherents in our country; their true quality may be judged from their divergent approaches to the ideals of democracy. Those who define socialism as the common ownership of the means of production, which in practical terms means the state monopoly of economic power, react to the slowness or inefficiency of the democratic process by wanting to seize such power and achieve their objectives through the assumption of absolute power. There is however another school of socialism that disapproves of the concentration of economic power either in the hands of individuals or in those of the state, and seeks an equitable distribution of wealth such as is envisaged in Articles 38 and 39 of the Indian Constitution. It is confusing that these divergent approaches to the building of a social order should be known by the same label, namely, socialism. The confusion however suits the former variety of socialism, for it is part of his strategy that until absolute power comes into the hands of his party, he should continue to claim that socialism is a dynamic concept in need of a continuing process of redefinition, and that, as of now, socialism means the equitable distribution of economic power, and to achieve this, all he would ask for is a certain abridgement of the freedoms of the liberal democratic process. The trustful citizen may not discover until it is too late that it is easier to harness freedom than to harness poverty.

The enemies of freedom come from both extremes. One consists of those who sling the promise of freedom and exploit the freedom of the democratic system for self-aggrandisement. This leads inevitably to the stance of the other extreme that would view freedom as an impediment to the attainment of a just social order. Democracy does not have to choose between these two perverse views of freedom. The freedom on which democracy subsists is inseparable from the other values that are involved along with it in the promise to the Indian Constitu-

tion, namely, justice, equality and fraternity. These values are indispensable constituents of a just social order. Advancement to them, however, is not a matter of slogans or gimmicks, it means hard work and unrelenting vigilance. It also means self-fulfilment.

J.B. Kripalani

When in 1947 India achieved its independence, it was only a partial political change, because the voter in our democracy lacked the necessary political education and awareness. The economic and social conditions did not change. The poverty and unemployment of the masses did not end, or even diminish, by the transfer of power to Indian hands. In the social field there was no change. It was a caste- and class-ridden society.

The basic policies and programs of the Congress before independence were laid down by Gandhi. They were conceived in terms of the factual conditions existing in the country. As these conditions remained the same, the same remedies should have been applied. Why were they not?

It was because Congress politicians in general did not understand Gandhi's comprehensive plans and programs. The socialists of those days described Gandhi as a reactionary, a friend of the capitalists and, therefore, of the imperialists. The more charitable among them afterwards described him as a revivalist. Leaving aside the socialists, the Swagists could not understand him either. Even leading Congressmen failed in this respect. Jawaharlal ridiculed spinning as an 'old dame's work'. As late as 1938, in an exchange of letters with Gandhi, Jawaharlal wrote

You know how intensely I have admired you and believe in you . . . I have done so in spite of the fact that I hardly agreed with anything that some of your previous publications—*Indian Home Rule*, etc.—contain . . . If we are to win . . . all Khads become universal in India, we shall have to wait till the Greek Kalends . . . in an article . . . you gave some newspaper cuttings from America about crime and immorality and contrasted American civilization with India. I felt it was something like Catherine Mayo drawing conclusions from some unrepresentative hospital statistics . . . You have stated somewhere that India has nothing to learn from the West and that she had reached a pinnacle of wisdom in the past. I entirely disagree with this viewpoint and I neither think that the so-called Rama Raj was very good in the past nor do I want it back . . . You have advanced very eloquently and forcefully the claims of dandamayana . . . I do believe that the remedy you have suggested is very helpful to them . . . But I doubt very much if the fundamental

causes of poverty are touched by it. You do not say a word against the semi-feudal zamindari system . . . or against the capitalist exploitation of both the workers and the consumers." (*Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Vol. 3, pp. 14-15)

Whether Jawaharlal was properly interpreting Gandhi or not, the fact remains that this was his understanding of him. Such was, and is, the understanding of Gandhi and his program by the intellectuals.

Congressmen in general were concerned only with the narrow political problem of the removal of foreign imperial rule. They supported the rest of Gandhi's program as a concession to his dynamic political leadership in the freedom fight. Gandhi accepted them, as he often said, as he had to work with the material he had. He could mould it only slightly.

As against this, what were Gandhi's ideas about the reconstruction of the country after independence? In order to understand this it is necessary to study the method of Gandhi's work. He was not an academician. He was not a theoretician. He did not work out his plans and programs in a library. He did not write learned theses about them. He tackled factual problems confronting the country and its people, in a practical and pragmatic manner. Theory was arrived at as a consequence of results obtained. It did not precede practice and experiment.

For instance, 80 per cent of the Indian masses live in villages on agriculture, with the land divided into small holdings. Mills and factories could not be established under foreign rule. Even if they could, they would not have provided work for the millions of unemployed and the semi-employed. They had to be provided with work in the villages, to supplement their meagre earnings from their tiny plots of land. What could be a more convenient instrument of production for them than the charkha? It has no preconceived theory to support it!

Political problems too were to be tackled factually. The old panchayat system had provided effective local self-government to the villagers. It had almost been destroyed by the centralized foreign government, yet its traditions were alive. The ignorant masses, knowing their own needs, could work it. On this Panchayat Raj as the base was to be built the all-India structure of democracy. Gandhi wanted to build from below upwards, not from the top to the base. In social matters too, Gandhi was pragmatic. Unless there was Hindu-Muslim unity, he propheticly said that rivers of blood would flow, as they have been flowing even after independence. Untouchability is a great and festering wound in the body politic. Its removal would also remove the caste-system among the Hindus.

So also, other problems in India were tackled by Gandhi on practical and pragmatic bases. Every scheme of reform was based on the existing condition. There was no preconceived theory of socialism or

any other man behind any of his schemes.

The only basic principles he pointed to were truth and nonviolence. And it is on these that democracy is based. These virtues are also necessary for international peace.

Gandhi's views about democracy were his own. They do not imply an isolated individual living like Robinson Crusoe on a solitary island, but a social individual, who is born, lives and has his being in society. Therefore, he must live within a social discipline. Even his salvation can only be achieved in society and not in a cave or on a mountain top. Therefore did Gandhi hold that rights flow from duties fulfilled. There can be no rights antecedent to duties, which by their nature are social.

From the above it will be seen that Gandhi in working for the removal of poverty did not think in terms of an undefined and undefinable "socialism". His ideas about democracy implied the social individual. We call him the Father of the Nation. Why? Because he knew the pulse of the nation and its requirements more than any other past or present leader. In the reforms he advocated, he had indicated pioneer work under the handicaps of foreign rule. He expected his pioneer efforts to be pushed forward and to cover the country after Swaraj. To the extent we have failed in this, we have been unable to solve the national problems a quarter of a century after independence.

R.C. Majumdar

Since the achievement of independence the Government of India has professed to follow the twofold policy of democracy and socialism, sometimes called socialistic pattern, the exact meaning or nature of which still remains a mystery. Events have shown that these two are incompatible and that combining them has been the cause of almost all the woes from which the country has been suffering.

The democracy professed by the Government has proved to be nothing but rank autocracy under a thinly veiled disguise of outer form. The main cause of this was the decision to start with adult franchise in a country where about three-fourths of the population are illiterate and the remaining have no familiarity with the truly democratic form of government. Be it remembered that even in the United Kingdom, generally known as the mother of democracies, adult franchise was not introduced till 1911.

Comparable to this is the immediate starting of a number of heavy industries in a country which had little training in that line. In both cases, India was made to run before it learnt to walk.

The net result is that Free India never enjoyed the blessings of either democracy or socialism, but suffered from the evils of both. This may be illustrated by a few facts and views which I have been able to

gather from the writings of eminent authorities on the subject.

"The achievements of India's five year plans are hardly proportionate to the investment in the many projects. The public sector, so called, does not show a picture of business efficiency or public responsibility. With a few exceptions the public sector undertakings present a dismal scene of waste, inefficiency and corruption. The dream of a socialistic pattern of society has rapidly faded leaving in its trail frustration and conflict." The cause of this is explained by another authority as follows. 'We have neither freedom in the private sector, corresponding to what took place in the U.K. and the U.S. in the early stages of economic growth, nor freedom in the public sector, corresponding to what has been taking place in recent decades in the communist states. On the other hand, we have restraints on public entrepreneurs because of political freedom and democracy, and restraints on the private sector because of the freedom of association of workers and labour legislation."¹

How the causes of failure are inherent in the system of nationalisation has been explained by another eminent authority by drawing attention to its obvious defects, namely, 'lack of competition and the absence of urgent need for diversification, improvement and discovery of new technical know-how', which make it stagnant and unprogressive."²

The same writer further observes 'One inevitable consequence of establishing state monopolies is to elevate the power of monopoly trade unions against them. If you run a strike against a nationalised industry, it will usually be something like 100 per cent effective, because nobody can break the strike by stepping up production in competing firms with blacklegs or non-union labour."³ The sooner the Government of India realises that nationalisation and the right to strike are incompatible, the better for our already impoverished country.

Another grave defect in the system is that ultimate control over these undertakings is vested in senior officials, often having neither experience nor youthful energy to adapt themselves to the changing circumstances, which require free thinking and the capacity for bold decisions.

The communist countries enforce discipline by ruthless measures against workers, but this is not possible for a so-called democratic government which has to depend upon trade-unions for votes at the next election. This subservency has generated a spirit of seditious

1. S. F. Agar, *The Commonwealth in South Asia*, p. 237.

2. *Freedom and Development* (published by India International Centre), pp. 43-44.

3. An article by Mr Norman Macrae, Deputy Editor of the *Evening Star* in its issue of April 24-May 4, 1971.

4. *Ibid.*

for law and order in every section of public life which is eating into the vitals of national life. The events of last ten years all over India confirm the common belief that only organised violence or prolonged strikes will compel the Government to accept the demands pressed upon them. This belief or spirit is no longer confined to industrial workers but has spread to all sections of society, including students, teachers, and employees of the Government and of semi-governmental institutions like banks. This morning's papers refer to the violent actions of a body of teachers and the firing by the police to check them, which caused an uproar in the Legislative Assembly of Assam. The most serious development in the growing lawlessness and violence in the country is the emergence of students as a pressure group not only in academic but also in political matters. A certain University in Bengal has been forced to accept students as investigators in examinations where almost universal copying is the order of the day. Another University in Bengal has agreed to appoint student representatives on its administrative bodies. The latest instance of the influence exercised by students on the actual administration of the country is afforded by the struggle between two organisations of students in Bengal, both belonging to the Congress party, which is causing great concern to the Chief Minister of West Bengal, if not also to the Prime Minister of India.

The nature of the severe disease which is afflicting the body politic is not much in doubt. The question of quackery is the remedy. Mr Mahadewan has suggested that we should try the remedy propounded by Mahatma Gandhi, 'who swore neither by democracy nor by socialism but whose basis of political philosophy was "truth"—no dogma but the resilience that responds creatively to changing reality'. Unfortunately, as an ordinary man like me, not infused into the essence of gandhian philosophy, his 'non-ideological alternative', to which we are asked to give a trial, does not convey any concrete idea of thought or action. We must have a more definite scheme, ideal and line of action before the common people may judge of its full implication and make their choice.

K. R. Malkani

I quite disagree with the thesis that India has been riding two horses at one and the same time—democracy and socialism—and that in the earlier stage democracy stole the show and socialism lagged behind and now socialism is becoming a fact and democracy is receding. We have never had much of a democracy and we don't have any socialism.

On less than 50 per cent votes, the Congress has been securing 75 per cent seats and exercising 100 per cent power. And for most of the time the Congress has been a one-man or one-woman show. As for socialism,

the less and the better. There is even less socialism in the 'socialist' budgets of Indira Gandhi and Y. B. Chavan than there was in the 'reactionary' budgets of T. T. Krishnamachari and Morarji Deas. In democracy, as in socialism, we have the form and not the substance—the husk and not the grain.

Actually democracy and socialism are not only not incompatible, they are two sides of the same coin. Socialism is economic democracy, democracy is political socialism. The two can not only go together, they have got to go together—if either of them is to materialise at all.

Democratic socialism is a living fact in Western Europe and Japan. It can be a fact in India too. The biggest single reason why the possible is not yet the actual, is the general backwardness of the country. As long as this backwardness continues, everything that we do will be backward. Today our democracy is backward and so is our capitalism. Our socialism if, as and when it comes, will also be a backward socialism. I should not be surprised that, if we ever have a dictator, it will be a backward dictatorship. These are the politico-economic compulsions of a backward country.

It is easy enough to talk of Gandhism as the panacea for all our ills, but Gandhism did not prevail even during the life-time of Gandhi, and since his death, it has definitely been on the retreat. On issues after issues, whether it is food control or birth control, prohibition or language, the Government of India has been a monument to anti-Gandhi. But we are yet to hear a voice of gandhian protest against it all.

It is possible that after a couple of centuries, Gandhi will be re-discovered and Gandhism will be given a serious trial. It has happened before. Christianity didn't come into its own till a few centuries after Christ. Even Buddhism did not come into its own till the emergence of Ashoka, three centuries later. It is, therefore, quite possible that, after a prolonged period of trial and error, this country—and, maybe, many other countries—will re-discover Gandhi. But till then we seem to be condemned to our present purgatory wherein each solution seems to be only worse than the previous one. The only consolation is that by this process of rejection, 'non-sens', we will hopefully arrive at a more valuable and a longer lasting solution.

S.N. Mirra

Nobody can honestly deny the fact that the freedom of India was hastened and won by Mahatma Gandhi. It is thus unfortunate that those who inherited the fruits of independence have today completely and unhesitatingly left behind his ideas and ideals for selfish reasons.

In 25 years of independence, it is on account of the disregard which we have shown for the gandhian philosophy that, in spite of whatever

we could do, we Congressmen are today in such misery, distress and downright disgrace. I know I am saying nothing new. Tulsidas said it centuries ago:

darjuna jhu hadhat pavit,
prathamaat hah uchh stha rasat.

"Do a good turn to an evil man and he will, far from thanking you, recompense your destruction!"

For the prosperity of our country, I believe the following five fundamental principles provide the strongest foundation: (1) Prayer, (2) Peace, (3) Purity, (4) Piety, and (5) Production. I am assured that our leaders have ignored each one of them. Therefore is our search for prosperity a cry in the wilderness.

PRAYER. This has become a taboo, in the name of secularism, as if secularism bans our obligation to the Creator. Its absence has killed and blackened our conscience.

PEACE. In spite of Mahatma Gandhi's having laid down his life for peace, our present leaders seem to believe that they should be traders rather than secure peace for the people of the country by devoting themselves to law and order.

PURITY. This is now a rarity. No administrator in the country has thought of tackling the problem, so that today purity cannot be found either high up or low down. All efforts and suggestions made by others never meet with the approval of those who should restore purity. God alone knows where we will be headed.

PIETY. This is a basic foundation of secularism, but in actual practice the difference between the lowest and the highest in this country is anything between 1 and 100 per cent. The majority of the Government and the bureaucrats are alone responsible for this state of affairs.

PRODUCTION. Affluence is possible only when there is a high rate of production. But the interest of the Government seems to be in controls, and controls at every stage. This has killed the enthusiasm in the producer and scarcity conditions prevail in each and every section of our economic life. Thus even the fifth fundamental principle of Mahatma Gandhi has been crushed in actual practice.

I can only pray to the Almighty to give wisdom to those that are arrogant, awakening to those in slumber and repentance to those who claim to follow Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy. Even at this stage, we can save the country from chaos, destruction and revolution.

Piloo Mody

I am delighted to read Mr Mahadevan's thesis because it so accurately reflects my own feelings. As a matter of fact this has been my bone of contention with my friend, the Pakistan President, Mr Shatto, and

it is my constant argument with all radicals and socialists who are pseudo-democrats and all democrats who are pseudo-radicals and socialists. There is no doubt that the former have willingly used the latter and the latter have capitalized on the strength of the former. Whichever way you look at it, the unholy alliance has dragged the country away from the path laid down in the Constitution into the wilderness of anarchy. In the process a new language had to be invented in which the words come from English, but the thoughts emanate from those who wish to deceive, confuse and ultimately paralyse.

Socialism is an economic theory which glorifies the state at the cost of the individual, and democracy is a system designed to protect the individual from the state. Only Nehruvian logic, Mrs Indira Gandhi's cleverness and the dexterity of the Congress Party could even attempt to sell a concept like Democratic Socialism. To a very large extent this has been the basis of arbitrary rule in India, with our rulers claiming to be democratic when they did not wish to do a thing and socialist when they wanted to trample on the rights of the people. Fortunately they have been found out. One cannot say whether it has been a day too soon or a day too late. But one thing is certain that those who swore by Democratic Socialism have lost their zest for democracy; and now it is a question of touch and go whether the system will triumph or these evil forces which made a mockery out of it.

Hiren Mukerjee

Mr Mahadevan has, with his 'eyes and ears open' (to quote his deliberate words), chosen to let loose a piece of polemic which, with all due respect, seems to me to be totally contrary to Gandhi's thinking and practice.

History is never easy to make—a truth of life which Gandhi fully understood and kept in mind. One step was often enough for Gandhi, but even as he took it he never took his eyes off the goal. Not being prone to intellectual analysis, he was careful of keeping away from long-term, ideological formulations. As Mr Mahadevan says, he was not 'dogmatic', but he was, always, to the best of his understanding, *principled*. Whatever programs and policies he put forward were never what Mr Mahadevan expressively and polemically dubs as the 'trans-ideological alternative' to such concepts as democracy and socialism.

To Mr Mahadevan, unhappily, there seems to exist an insurmountable dichotomy between 'socialism' and 'democracy'. With his pleasant knack of coining words, he would have made Gandhi chuckle at the description of him as 'at best a half-hearted democrat and a reluctant socialist'. One fact, however, that Gandhi was the sort of person who would never be a reluctant whatever-have-you, nor would he expound

something to which he gave only half his heart. He was too sure of his faith and of himself—which, indeed, was the secret of his strength. And he claimed, entirely truthfully as far as he was concerned, that he was more genuinely socialist than others who claimed the label and of course a truer democrat than many who wore the appellation. In his own way—which may not and need not necessarily be ours today—he had found the organic link between the two concepts in the real life of peoples.

Addressing in Ahmedabad the judge who tried him for his leadership of the non-cooperation struggle (March 1922), Gandhi used words that cannot be erased from the mind of whoever heard or read them. 'The government of British India is carried on for the exploitation of the masses. The miserable little comforts of the town-dwellers in India represent the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, and the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence presented by the skeletons that one sees in the Indian villages. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town-dwellers in India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unparalleled in history.'

There may be a few verbal errors in this citation from memory, but they can only be very minor. Gandhi's point is plain. He does not make an ideological rally against 'imperialism', but he states the simple, basic, heart-felt truth of the matter. He even uses a word which is significant—'town-dwellers', meaning the same thing as the 'bourgeoisie' (residents of 'burgs', 'bourgs')—a word which, because of its peculiar use, may well have been distasteful to him.

In April 1928 he wrote to Jawaharlal Nehru who had then begun to have doubts about a democracy which does not merge into socialism: 'I entirely agree with you that one day we shall have to have a movement without the rich and the vocal educated class, but that time is not yet'.

For Gandhi, of course, 'that time' never came, and impatient socialists have naturally reviled at it. But the main point is that Gandhi knew, in his own way, that a movement of the people ('demon') had to be cranked in the direction of socialism and the necessary coordination was always, again in his own way, his objective.

Perhaps it will not be wrong to say that with his stress on the right 'means' to achieve truly desired 'ends', Gandhi always fought shy of whatever threatened to make the price of social change too heavy and harmful to man's finer instincts. The cost of revolution has, throughout history, been something of a deterrent to many minds and for the basic transformation of society. Gandhi's chosen heir, Jawaharlal Nehru, wrote in his autobiography, quoting R.H. Tawney, of the claim war that might develop and the stern steps that might be indispensable for such-

ing the present possessor of power—onions, he said, could be peeled leaf by leaf, but a live tiger could not be skinned that way, since it would try to do the skinning first. Perhaps Mr Mahadevan remembers Bernard Shaw saying in 1931, after he had met Gandhi, that Gandhi was 'Mahatma Major' while Shaw was 'Mahatma Minor'. He might also recall a Fabian lecture which Shaw concluded thus: 'I am impatient for the revolution. I shall be jolly happy if the revolution happens to-morrow. But being an average coward I want you to make the revolution in as gentlemanly a manner as possible.' Gandhi and Jawaharlal would not perhaps say 'No' to the aversment.

One may or may not believe that socialism is the fulfilment of democracy, but there seems little reason to think of the two as Scylla and Charybdis which had both better be avoided. One may or may not believe that the spirit underlying both democracy and socialism is profoundly similar if not actually identical—the former more fundamentally relevant to 'means' and the latter to 'ends'. But it is difficult to appreciate the power so aptly formulated by Mr Mahadevan.

Let not Gandhi's dream of the non-acquisitive society to be achieved by right means be equated with opportunism which, one fears, is what Mr Mahadevan euphemistically calls 'resilience responding to reality'.

Gandhi stood on firm ground, where democracy and socialism converged, coalesced and created a new life for humanity.

E.M.S. Namboodripad

The discussion of the question posed before us requires at the very outset a definition of the terms 'democracy' and 'socialism'. I am of the view that if the terms are correctly defined, there is no contradiction between them. On the other hand, if the definition is wrong, there will be found to be obvious contradictions.

The founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, in their classical document, 'The Communist Manifesto', said: 'All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.'

This sums up the correct understanding of 'democracy', and 'socialism' according to scientific socialism. It shows that the two concepts are not only not contradictory but are integrally connected with each other. Wresting from the hands of the owning classes economic as well as political power which they have been wielding for centuries and ex-

gaining the collective use of that power by society—such is the essence of social change as envisaged by the authors of the Communist Manifesto.

As opposed to this, the ideologues of the bourgeoisie define 'democracy' as a system in which there is the formality of a periodical election by the entire adult population, supplemented by such other formalities as the technical-constitutional responsibility of the executive to the legislature, the liability of the members of the executive and the legislature being challenged by the judiciary, and so on, leading to a series of mutual checks and balances.

It is the contrast of these formalities that, according to them, makes India, U.S.A., U.K. and so on 'democracies', while their absence makes U.S.S.R., China and other socialist countries 'totalitarian'.

As for socialism, the bourgeois ideologues would have us believe, it is a system under which there is a greater amount of equality in the distribution of wealth, even while the ownership of the instruments and means of production is left as it is in the hands of a narrow circle of owning classes.

It is necessary in this connection, to note that ever since the dawn of history, human society has been divided into a toiling majority and an owning minority. The 'good old days' when human society was organized on the basis of complete equality and man did not exploit man, came to an end because the productive capacity of mankind had risen to such an extent that hard work by the toiling majority could keep the owning minority at an ever-increasing level of comfort and luxury. The possibility of such a 'good life' for the minority, vouchsafed for by the hard work of the majority, made it necessary that both political as well as economic power should be wielded by the minority.

This is the essence of the historic break through which the two 'great institutions'—private property and the coercive power of the state—came into existence.

The two institutions of private property and the state have undergone successive changes: naked autocracy, benevolent dictatorship, militarism, local village republics over which is superimposed the system of a feudal-banocratic state, and so on—all these in the political field. In the field of economic ownership, chattel slavery, caste oppression, serfdom and so on.

Passing through these multifarious forms of economic and political domination, the owning classes developed that most sophisticated system of state and private property in the modern bourgeois age, namely, formal parliamentary democracy combined with an economy under which there is 'complete equality' between the employer and the employee. The crudest and crudest inhumanity inherent in earlier systems of domination by the owning minority are done away with in favour of the formal con-

image of 'freedom, equality and fraternity'!

Behind this cover, however, is the reality of bourgeois domination over the common people who are subjected to innumerable forms of oppression and exploitation—under the fine garb of 'equality and fraternity'. The owning classes' domination over the state machinery is sought to be covered up by the attributes of formal democracy—a system in which, said Lenin, 'the common people are perfectly entitled to choose every five years who among their exploiters shall rule over them for the next five years'.

The ending of this system, both in its economic as well as political aspects, is the aim of all genuine socialists, as was clearly explained by the authors of the Communist Manifesto in the above-quoted passage.

The difficulties that we are now facing in our country are, in fact, a further confirmation of the fact that, behind the cover of the two claims of 'democracy' and 'socialism', our own ruling classes are further tightening the noose around the common people. The only solution for these difficulties, therefore, is to see that power—both economic and political—is wrested from the hands of these owning classes and turned over to the common people.

Shriam Norayan

At the outset, let me make it very clear that I do not regard democracy and socialism as incompatible. In fact, I am of the definite view that democracy in order to be real must ensure social justice, and true socialism must necessarily be based on democracy. A democracy which is controlled, more or less, by a dozen or more business houses is, in reality, only a plutocracy. Similarly, socialism as preached in the Soviet Union and the East European countries is communism, pure and simple. It should not be confused with the socialism which India has been trying to establish over the years through the Five Year Plans.

The Parliament of India, in December 1954, adopted the 'socialist pattern of society' as the objective of its social and economic policy. The 'Preamble', the 'Fundamental Rights' and the 'Directive Principles' of the Constitution of India also indicate the basic framework of Indian socialism which is essentially a golden mean between laissez-faire and totalitarianism. In this sense, the socialist pattern in India is neither free private enterprise nor communism. The Second Five Year Plan had made it abundantly clear that the 'socialist pattern' was not 'a rigid dogma', and that 'each country has to develop according to its own genius and traditions'. The Third Plan also stated in unambiguous terms that 'with the rapid expansion of the economy, wider opportunities of growth arise for both the public and private sector, and in many ways their activities are complementary'. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has

observed on several occasions that socialism in India must not be a 'carbon copy' of other countries; we must chalk out our own path in accordance with our cultural heritage and requirements. In truth, lasting welfare and prosperity of the people could be realized only on the basis of the widest participation of the masses in the process of planned economic development.

It is true that in recent years several actions of the Union Government in nationalizing commercial banks, general insurance and coal mines and taking over the wholesale trade in foodgrains have created in the country an atmosphere of suspicion and uncertainty, and private investment has become rather paralytic. Since ours is a mixed economy, it is not the principle of nationalizing some key industries which is in dispute, it is really the manner and method of doing this which raise the dust of opposition and controversy. The Prime Minister as well as the Union Finance Minister have recently declared in categorical words that the Government has no intention of nationalizing more industries only for the sake of nationalization, and that any further action will be taken only after the fullest consideration of all the aspects.

In this context, I should like to suggest that the Union Government should soon publish for the information of the general public certain specific criteria and guidelines for nationalization of industries in the future. This would inspire trust among industrialists and businessmen and create an atmosphere of stability and confidence.

At any rate, I have no manner of doubt that the existing industrial policy of the Government of India is a sound one and should be pursued further with faith and vigour. While the objectives of justice and equality should be achieved without much delay, the equally important aims of liberty and fraternity must not be hyped and suppressed. Indian socialism has to safeguard both the dignity of the individual as well as the unity and well-being of society. With this end in view, both the public as well as the private sector should be treated as integral parts of the National Sector. There should be healthy emulation between the two and the present 'cold war' between them should yield place to a climate of constructive cooperation.

Mahatma Gandhi had placed before the country his concept of 'trusteeship' which should permeate private business and industrial activity. In my opinion, this idea is not utopian philosophy but practical wisdom. It is high time that this Gandhian principle is translated into action in a practical manner. In place of the current atmosphere of class war and mutual recrimination, the trusteeship model would be able to generate a feeling of goodwill and fruitful cooperation between the Government and the entrepreneurs. Gandhi had repeatedly told us that socialism was as pure as crystal and required 'crystal-like means to achieve it'. Violence and even legislative coercion would not lead to the

right type of socialism which seeks to prevent the exploitation of the people by the vested interests.

It is the duty of India, therefore, to show a new way to other developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and prove beyond an iota of doubt that socialism under democracy is a practicable ideal and could be sustained without bloodshed and bad blood, through a process of persuasion, discussion and public education. This is a task which requires the concerted efforts of all of us for its fulfilment and brooks no delay.

In sum, there is no question of 'riding two horses' in pursuing the objective of a socialist democracy. On the contrary, if we now try to change horses in midstream, we shall be doing a great disservice to India which happens to be the very first country in the world to launch the bold experiment of comprehensive economic planning under a democratic set-up. There have been, surely, a number of shortcomings and even failures in this national adventure. But I have little doubt that India is on the right path, and we must not falter and stumble at this stage.

V.R. Narai

I disagree with the central proposition that 'democracy and socialism are incompatible—however much we may juggle with catch-phrases like "democratic socialism" and "socialist democracy". They cannot co-exist without the one eroding into the other. They cannot be blended into one concoction except in a highly diluted form'. They can co-exist, they can be blended without the one diluting the other.

But this will be possible only when there is firm faith in, and utter dedication to, both democracy and socialism. Unfortunately, our Hindu ethos is inimical to both the ideals. A believer in the false theories of karma and rebirth which justify the 'gradations and degradations' of the caste system cannot be either a democrat or a socialist. And it is the Hindu ethos that is still dominating our social and political life.

At no stage during the past twenty-five years of our independence were we really sincere about democracy or socialism. Is it any wonder, then, that what we now have is an apology for democracy and a perversion of socialism?

I believe that what Gandhi cherished most were truth and sincerity. Our greatest betrayal of Gandhi is, according to me, in being neither truthful nor sincere in almost everything we say and do.

N.G. Ranga

The Indian masses, in their agony over the failure of our democracy, which (as Mr Mahadevan puts it) 'had stolen the show' during the

past 25 years, have given their reply in unambiguous terms and expressed ecstasy over Mrs Indira Gandhi's bold answer of 'Garibi Hato' ('End Poverty') to the present question, "Which way then shall we go?"

It is wrong to assume that there is an irreconcilable contradiction (or dichotomy) between democracy and socialism. Is there no democracy in Sweden's socialist society? Is not Great Britain growing into a full-fledged socialist society through her mature democracy? Indeed, is not the American so-called free-enterprise, tycoon-led democracy moving towards socialism despite her resistent protestations? What about Italy, France, even West Germany? Are they merely content with democracy?

True, Soviet Russia and Peoples' China have rushed into the soul-killing embraces of dictatorship, albeit of the so-called proletarian kind, in their impatient march towards socialism. Does it mean that it is impossible for them to try to recover democratic freedom, human rights and allow room for individual initiative, incentive and privacy and poetic flights into the space-world of unfettered thoughts and imaginative meanings? The appearance of writers like Pasternak and Solzhenitsyn indicates that even communist dictatorship cannot be so airtight and that the urge for democracy is eternal and cannot be smothered. In fact, Khrushchev's historic thesis at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party is a confession made to the conscience of the communist world that communist dictatorship has found it essential to welcome democracy.

Stalin came to be repugned so violently by that Congress and by his weakened and fattered disciple just because he did not welcome and strengthen Tito's Yugoslavian efforts to soften and enable communist control through democratic freedoms and humane institutions. In the same way, we of the Grand Alliance, who were horrified at the prospect of an ever-tightening tangle of controls over the unfettered practice of democratic fundamental rights and constitutional safeguards, were repugned by more than two-thirds of the newly elected M.P.s, who swore their allegiance to Mrs Gandhi. Russians are being targeted, even though in an unhistoric manner, by Mao's Chinese for yielding to democracy. Are those of us among the democrats Gandhians to be similarly targeted, in disregard of the teachings of history, for our acceptance of the March 1971 revolution towards socialism? I say 'No'.

While the communist-minded masses and intellectuals of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and even of Poland have been heralding their passion for democracy, within their overall socialist set up, why should we not welcome the democratic choice being made by our long-suffering, ill-fed, ill clothed and suppressed masses?

It is ungrateful to assume that Gandhi would care at the choice made by our masses in the 1971 and 1972 democratic elections for the

Lok Sabha and the State assemblies respectively—because he was a democrat *par excellence*.

It is possible for Gandhians to go on quoting Gandhi's sayings against one another, but none can quote anything from Gandhi against the greatest priority he gave to the feeding, clothing, housing, educating and humanising of India's *dandamayana*. Mrs Gandhi is now engaged in persuading our democracy and its almost unmanageable administration to suspend, condition or soften—on the lines of Portia's plea—some of the powers, privileges and freedoms so long enjoyed by the few, in order to help the masses in their long deferred efforts to raise their human values and march in lead with at least the last of the stragglers of the privileged people. I am convinced Gandhi would have most willingly wished her success in this. It is because of that conviction that so many of us who have been championing the self-employed masses of peasants and artisans and who had vainly hoped that the privileged changes in our democracy would help our submerged masses to be freed from their sub-human living and undemocratic disabilities, have decided boldly and sincerely to help Mrs Gandhi to fit socialism into Indian democracy. Gandhians ought to help our democracy to uplift its vision and revolutionise its institutions and harness the political approaches of its leaders and thus metamorphose itself into a socialist democracy, which can meet the worldwide and irresistible challenge—one that brooks no delay—of the *dandamayana*.

If this means the acceptance of some controls, let them be democratically controlled. If it means the disciplining of many people to achieve greater results and higher production, let it be a gandhian type of discipline. If it demands sacrifices from the 'haves' to lessen the rigours of the 'have nots' or the shedding of some millennium-old social privileges and religious prejudices, let them be brought about in the same satyagrahic manner in which untouchability and the priority orders were dropped by our democracy.

A.B. Shah

Mr Mahadevan's thesis formulates the dilemma before India as that of choosing between two ideological systems—namely, democracy and socialism—and offers Gandhi's 'trans-ideological alternative' as an escape from the horns of the dilemma. I disagree with Mr Mahadevan on both these points.

Mr Mahadevan assumes that democracy and socialism are mutually incompatible, 'however much we may juggle with catch-phrases like "democratic socialism" and "socialist democracy"'. According to him, they cannot coexist 'without the one sliding into the other'.

Is this really true? The answer, I guess, will depend on what one means by democracy and by socialism. Mr Mahadevan does not define either of the two terms, he proceeds on the assumption that each term conveys the same meaning to everyone. I do not know how far this assumption would be justified. If empirical evidence were to provide any indication, one would think that both 'democracy' and 'socialism' mean different things to different persons. For instance, to most people democracy means the rule of the majority, to some, it means 'government of the people, by the people, for the people'.

To me, 'democracy' means essentially two things. It means, first, a system of values centring upon the freedom and dignity of the individual, with all that this phrase would imply, with certain obvious limitations implied in it, in personal and interpersonal life. Thus, for me freedom of expression and of access to information, freedom of association, and the freedom to pursue happiness in one's own way so long as one does not encroach on the similar freedom of others are all implied in my conception of the freedom and dignity of the individual. Political, social and economic equality also is implied in this conception, since in the presence of gross inequalities in any of these spheres, the freedom of the weak is bound to be eroded by the power of those who are 'more equal than others'.

The other thing that 'democracy' means to me is the method of dialogue and of arriving at tentative working decisions on issues that have a bearing on interpersonal relations. The method of dialogue is obviously preferable to that of brute force since otherwise those who are lacking in the relevant kind of power would be at a disadvantage. Also, the method of dialogue in turn implies a rational, as against a traditional and authoritarian, approach to problems in the light of all available, relevant evidence.

The convention of majority rule expresses the need for taking working decisions in a situation in which unanimity is not possible. However, since no one in a given situation can claim to be in possession of all the relevant facts and to be completely free from bias of any kind, and since further the human situation itself is constantly changing, it is understood that such decisions will be subject to revision in the light of experience. This would be true even of unanimous decisions.

Secondly, since social action derives its justification from the values to which it promotes the freedom and dignity of the individual, no majority decision is valid from the standpoint of democracy if it is calculated to negate the values of democracy mentioned above. In other words, even a 100 per cent majority does not have the moral right to destroy democracy.

Socialism originally meant a concern for the weaker sections of society. Since the poor constituted these sections and since the owner-

ship and control of the means of production enabled the rich minority to exploit the weaker sections, socialism soon acquired a primarily economic connotation. Secondly, in course of time the humanist inspiration of the socialist movement receded to the background, and socialism increasingly came to be identified with public ownership of the means of production. Since no civilized human society can be conceived without a state, public ownership in effect meant ownership by the government or its subordinate organs.

I believe that this confusion of the economic program of classical socialism with the values which inspired socialism was the greatest defect that the socialist movement suffered at its very inception. The confusion was strengthened and rationalized by economic analysis of a simplistic kind because the urge for power inherent in the human mind soon got mixed up with the original humanist inspiration which moved the pioneers. However, this was not an accident, though this is not the place to go into it.

To me, socialism means the extension, to the economic sphere, of the value of equality implicit in the classical conception of democracy. I therefore see no insuperable contradiction between democracy and socialism, but only a problem of devising a system that would ensure an optimum realisation of the values of democracy. Since such a system, no matter how carefully designed, has to be worked by human beings, who are essentially 'imperfect', it is clear that democratic socialism can have no sacred policy dogmas, it can only mean an ongoing human experiment which proceeds by trial and error. The complexities of the modern age add to the difficulties and sophistication of the experiment. They should make even the most learned and honest of us humble in our approach.

Since I do not regard democratic socialism as a contradiction in terms, the problem of finding an alternative in terms of 'Gandhi's truth' does not arise for me. I do not understand what this truth can mean in discursive terms, nor can I see how it provides a trans-ideological alternative except in the trivial sense that ideologically it represents neither democracy nor socialism. As far as I have been able to understand Gandhi, he was a great humanist and therefore a great individualist. But his conceptions of truth and freedom were vitiated by a confusion between discursive truth as understood in the natural and social sciences, and intuitive non-discursive 'truth' as perceived by great artists, visionaries and moral reformers. Once again, this is not the place to go into details, and one must tent content with making a bald statement even at the risk of being misunderstood.

As I see it, the problem confronting India is not one of choosing between democracy and socialism, still less between either of them, on the one hand, and the 'trans-ideological alternative' of Gandhi, on the

other. It is, rather, that of instilling in the citizen a strong sense of his rights and obligations, and of building up autonomous centres of enlightened opinion and moral authority in different spheres of public life. For, unless the ordinary citizen is willing to do his duty and to fight for his rights in an organised and democratic manner, neither Mill nor Marx nor Gandhi can help him. This is essentially an educational and cultural task, which has so far been equally neglected by colonialist liberals, socialists and Gandhians. There are a variety of reasons for this neglect, but three of the most important are their attachment to outdated ideas, unwillingness to swim against the populist current and the lure of power and the privileges it brings in an undeveloped society.

Ka Naa Subramanyam

Democracy and socialism as commonly understood, though not well defined, are opposing ideologies. Democracy, faith in individual's need to be different, unique, free and non-conforming. Socialism is the need of the industrial man, not to buy the most he can whether he needs it or not, having the most number of things whether they bring satisfaction or not. Both these present-day needs need the education of the common man, in which in the twenty-five years of our independence we have been sadly lacking. The average Indian is not educated to either democracy or socialism. He cannot use his individual freedom to dissent and non-conform, he does not want the many material things that are thrust on him in the name of progress.

Democracy for the Indian rulers is a sort of shifting ground: for the Congress, without Gandhi, it was fraught with the danger that another party might oust it from power. Interested in entrenching itself as power permanently, the Congress finds it easier to swear by socialism. Marx might have been a prophet of sorts but his prophecy stopped quite short of realities, both the extreme examples of socialist states in recent history—Russia and China—were, at the time of achieving whatever socialism it was they achieved, ill-developed industrially and the party in power at the moment has entrenched itself in power, in the process promising all kinds of material things and prosperity to the people.

History demonstrates indisputably that ideologies are not what matter but institutions, inheritance and education. Mahatma Gandhi rightly or wrongly comprehended the inheritance of India as truth, a moral attitude to life and living. If India had cultivated the moral attitude to life, in spite of realising that moral values also change and justice is an abstraction without some kind of sense of moral values—what the Hindu was inclined to call *dharma*—it might have been easier in the long run.

Instead of which both Jawaharlal Nehru and, later, Mrs Indira

Gandhi preferred to stress ideologies to which a nation could be bent from on top. The result has been a lack of faith in plain living and high thinking which Mahatma Gandhi insisted was India's destiny. We have been reduced rather to plain living and plain thinking in these twenty-five years. It has not made for the happiness of the people and it has not made for the material prosperity of the people either, though the ruling ideologies do not recognize that fact as yet.

I am richer than my grandfather—just because I pay ten times more for the essentials of life. But I am not happier than my grandfather, though I am generally considered to be as ill-informed as he was. I tolerate more corruption, more hypocrisy, more injustice, all in the name of a socialism which is said to be round the next corner.

If Gandhi was a reluctant socialist and a half-hearted democrat it was not because he was trans-ideological but because man's life does not begin or end with ideologies, which have to be superimposed from on top. It was because of his instinctual realization that life was moral in all its aspects. It is this sense of morals that we seem to have missed in the twenty-five years of our independence.

There is unfortunately a feeling that the moral life is dependent on the religious life. It is the other way about—religion is dependent on morals. It is on the recovery of morals in life that the future of India will depend; not on slogans of democracy or socialism. But morals are far from the contemplation of the rulers that are. It is in his insistence on morals as the basis of life that Gandhi remains a leader to look up to, and it is here that others have woefully failed us.

Ramesh Thapar

Mr Mahadevan's thesis certainly captures the texture of the debate on our present political and economic crisis. But, as almost always, the texture is imitative, mechanistic, unrelated to the realities of India.

Democracy, socialism, secularism, are phrases which change their taste and smell as they move across frontiers, but the Indian situation becomes extraordinary because here these concepts have to be nurtured in a genuine multi-cultural, continental federal polity. Indeed the concepts are sought in order to cement the political, economic and social structure that is India. This is the forgotten factor in most theoretical analyses about India, and its absence creates an artificial confrontation between a mythical democracy and a mythical socialism.

We are democratic. We are socialist. We are secular. Imperfect, yes. Double-talking, certainly. But under heavy pressure to work out some sort of democratic, socialist, secular structure or else the whole fabric of federal India would collapse. This needs fuller understanding, or else we will be in danger of succumbing to the rather rigid political

formulas of very much more developed and less complicated western nations.

Let me spell it out. Our socialism, a mixture of private and public enterprise, has failed because the productive disciplines of a controlled socialist system have not been brought to bear on our society. Indeed the popular expression of democracy, romanticized by an anti-colonial undercurrent, has wrecked the national discipline which should underpin a socialist-type economic effort.

Our 'man' of democracy and socialism is of a land that has not been witnessed anywhere else. We attempt the democratic practices of the most advanced and affluent and inject into these a socialist theory which has long been abandoned by radical thinkers. In other words, we are living in the intellectual climate of the 'Yerties, the time when our leadership evolved its framework of ideology.

The general failure to apply catalytic concepts to the realities of India, and the uncertainty to the fortifying thought of the last two decades following World War II, have brought us to the prospect of a man-made disaster. The Indian appears to the world as a thoroughly incapable, selfish and short-sighted creature, unable to work for the transformation of the mass of his people.

Now that we have almost arrived at a zero rate of growth, we are compelled to think afresh. This thinking has begun, and naturally there is a going back to the vision of Gandhi. He was the lone voice promoting a genuine alternative rooted in the complex reality of India—the 'trans-ideological alternative', as Mr Mahadevan says. He believed that his alternative could make an impact on the poverty of the mass of the people.

The gandhian alternative, in its essentials, precedes the cultural revolution initiated by Mao Tse-tung. If the alternative had been adopted twenty-five years ago, and had seen a careful moulding in the fire of arduous practice by a party devoted to the tasks inherent in the quest for human liberation, we would probably have thrust forward a democracy towards a free, egalitarian society.

This was not to be. And now the return to the gandhian alternative demands the destruction of the powerful interests which have grown up over the past twenty-five years on the perpetuation of a corrupt and unequal system. The task of correction is forbidding, even demoralizing.

Clearly, the dilemma is man-made. Yet, it is possible to fuse responsible freedom with meaningful egalitarianism. But we will have to re-define our terms of reference. At the core of it all is what we understand by a civilized standard of living, and the value system which must underpin it. This has to be tackled. And it means that we will have to practise what we preach.

WHO'S WHO

Buddhadewa Bhattacharyya, Department of Political Science, Calcutta University

Trilok Chaudhary, Revolutionary Socialist Party.

Amritasanda Das, Gandhian Institute of Studies, Banaras.

D.N. Dasgupta, *Hindustan Standard*, Calcutta

V.V. Jahn, Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla.

J.B. Kripalani, close associate of Mahatma Gandhi

R.C. Majumdar, General Editor, *The History and Culture of the Indian People*.

K.R. Malkani, Editor, *Motherland*, New Delhi

S.N. Misra, Organisation Congress Party

Priya Mody, Swastika Party

Hiran Mukerjee, Communist Party.

E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Communist Party (Marxist).

Shrikanth Narayan, former Governor of Gujarat

V.R. Naidu, Editor, *Andhra Jyoti*, Hyderabad.

N.G. Ranga, Indian National Congress

A.B. Shah, Managing Editor, *Qaumi*, Bombay

Ka Naab Sahasramangam, novelist and critic

Ramesh Thapar, Editor, *Samachar*, New Delhi

The Equilibrium State

DENNIS L. MEADOWS

WE ARE BY NO MEANS THE FIRST PEOPLE in man's written history to propose some sort of non-growing state for human society. A number of philosophers, economists and biologists have discussed such a state and called it by many different names, with as many different meanings.

We have, after much discussion, decided to call the state of constant population and capital by the term 'equilibrium'. Equilibrium means a state of balance or equality between opposing forces. The opposing forces are those causing population and capital stock to increase (high desired family size, low birth-control effectiveness, high rate of capital investment) and those causing population and capital stock to decrease (lack of food, pollution, high rate of depreciation or obsolescence). The word 'capital' should be understood to mean services, industrial and agricultural capital combined. Thus the most basic definition of the state of global equilibrium is that population and capital are externally stable, with the forces tending to increase or decrease them in a carefully controlled balance.

There is much room for variation within that definition. We have only specified that the stocks of capital and population remain constant, but they might theoretically be constant at a high level or a low level—or one might be high and the other low. A tank of water can be maintained at a given level with a fast inflow and outflow of water or with a slow trickle in and out. If the flow is fast, the average drop of water will spend less time in the tank than if the flow is slow. Similarly, a stable population of any size can be achieved with either high, equal birth and death rates (short average lifetime) or low, equal birth and death rates (long average lifetime). A stock of capital can be maintained with high investment and depreciation rates or low investment and depreciation rates. Any combination of these possibilities would fit into our basic definition of global equilibrium.

What criteria can be used to choose among the many options available in the equilibrium state? The first decision that must be made concerns time. How long should the equilibrium state exist? If society is only interested in a time span of six months or a year, almost any level of population and capital could be maintained. If the time horizon is extended to 20 or 30 years, the options are greatly reduced, since the rates and levels must be adjusted to ensure that the capital investment rate will not be limited by resource availability during that time span, or that the death rate will not be uncontrollably influenced by pollution or food shortages. The longer a society prefers to maintain the state of equilibrium, the lower the rates and levels must be.

At the limit, of course, no population or capital level can be maintained forever, but that limit is very far away in time if resources are managed wisely and if there is a sufficiently long time horizon in planning. Let us take as a reasonable time horizon the expected lifetime of a child born into the world tomorrow—72 years if proper food and medical care are supplied. Since most people spend a large part of their time and energy raising children, they might choose as a maximum goal that the society left to those children can be maintained for the full span of the children's lives.

If society's time horizon is as long as 72 years, the permissible population and capital levels may not be too different from those existing today. The rates would be considerably different from those of today, however. Any society would undoubtedly prefer that the death rate be low rather than high, since a long, healthy life seems to be a universal human desire. To maintain equilibrium with long life expectancy, the birth rate then must also be low. It would be best, too, if the capital investment and depreciation rates were low, because the lower they are, the less resource depletion and pollution there will be. Keeping depletion and pollution to a minimum could either increase the maximum size of the population and capital levels or increase the length of time the equilibrium state could be maintained, depending on which goal the society as a whole preferred.

By choosing a fairly long time horizon for its existence, and a long average lifetime as a desirable goal, we have now arrived at a minimum set of requirements for the state of global equilibrium. They are:

1. The capital plant and the population are constant in size. The birth rate equals the death rate and the capital investment rate equals the depreciation rate.
2. All input and output rates—births, deaths, investment, and depreciation—are kept to a minimum.
3. The level of capital and population and the ratio of the two are set in accordance with the values of the economy. They may be deliberately revised and slowly adjusted as the advances of technology

creates new options.

An equilibrium defined in this way does not mean stagnation. Within the first two guidelines above, corporations could expand or fail, local populations could increase or decrease, income could become more or less evenly distributed. Technological advance would permit the services provided by a constant stock of capital to increase slowly. Within the third guideline, any country could change its average standard of living by altering the balance between its population and its capital. Furthermore, a society could adjust to changing internal or external factors by raising or lowering the population or capital stocks, or both, slowly and in a controlled fashion, with a predetermined goal in mind. The three points above define a dynamic equilibrium, which need not and probably would not "freeze" the world into the population-capital configuration that happens to exist at the present time. The object in accepting the above three statements is to create freedom for society, not to impose a straitjacket.

What would life be like in such an equilibrium state? Would innovation be stifled? Would society be locked into the patterns of inequality and injustice we see in the world today? Discussion of these questions must proceed on the basis of mental models, for there is no formal model of social conditions in the equilibrium state. No one can predict what sort of institutions mankind might develop under these new conditions. There is, of course, no guarantee that the new society would be much better or even much different from that which exists today. It seems possible, however, that a society released from struggling with the many problems caused by growth may have more energy and ingenuity available for solving other problems. In fact, we believe, as we shall illustrate below, that the evolution of a society that favours innovation and technological development, a society based on equality and justice, is far more likely to evolve in a state of global equilibrium than in the state of growth we are experiencing today.

Growth in the Equilibrium State

In 1857 John Stuart Mill wrote: "It is scarcely necessary to remark that a stationary condition of capital and population implies no stationary state of human improvement. There would be as much scope as ever for all kinds of mental culture, and moral and social progress, as much room for improving the Art of Living and much more likelihood of its being improved."¹

Population and capital are the only quantities that need to be constant in the equilibrium state. Any human activity that does not require a large flow of irreplaceable resources or produce severe environmental degradation might continue to grow indefinitely. In particular, those pursuits that many people would list as the most desirable and satisfying

activities of man—education, art, music, religion, basic scientific research, athletics, and social interactions—could flourish.

All of the activities listed above depend very strongly on two factors. First, they depend upon the availability of some surplus production after the basic human needs of food and shelter have been met. Second, they require leisure time. In any equilibrium state the relative levels of capital and population could be adjusted to assure that human material needs are fulfilled at any desired level. Since the amount of material production would be essentially fixed, every improvement in production methods could result in increased leisure for the population—leisure that could be devoted to any activity that is relatively non-consuming and non-polluting, such as those listed above. Thus, the unhappy situation described by Bertrand Russell could be avoided. "Suppose that, at a given moment, a certain number of people are engaged in the manufacture of pins. They make as many pins as the world needs, working (pay) eight hours a day. Someone makes an invention by which the same number of men can make twice as many pins as before. But the world does not need twice as many pins. Pins are already so cheap that hardly any more will be bought at a lower price. In a sensible world, everybody concerned in the manufacture of pins would take to working four hours instead of eight, and everything else would go on as before. But in the actual world this would be thought demoralizing. The men still work eight hours, there are too many pins, some employers go bankrupt, and half the men previously concerned in making pins are thrown out of work. There is, in the end, just as much leisure as on the other plan, but half the men are totally idle while half are still over-worked. In this way it is assured that the unavoidable leisure shall cause misery all around instead of being a universal source of happiness. Can anything more insane be imagined?"

But would the technological improvements that permit the production of pins or anything else more efficiently be forthcoming in a world where all basic material needs are fulfilled and additional production is not allowed? Does man have to be pushed by hardship and the incentive of material growth to devise better ways to do things?

Historical evidence would indicate that very few key inventions have been made by men who had to spend all their energy overcoming the immediate pressures of survival. Atomic energy was discovered in the laboratories of basic science by individuals unaware of any threat of fossil fuel depletion. The first genetic experiments, which led a hundred years later to high-yield agricultural crops, took place in the peace of a European monastery. Pressing human need may have forced the application of these basic discoveries to practical problems, but only freedom from need produced the knowledge necessary for the practical applications.

Technological advance would be both necessary and welcome in the equilibrium state. A few obvious examples of the kinds of practical discoveries that would enhance the workings of a steady state society include: (a) new methods of waste collection, to decrease pollution and make discarded material available for recycling; (b) more efficient techniques of recycling, to reduce rates of resource depletion; (c) better product design to increase product lifetime and promote easy repair, so that the capital depreciation rate would be minimized; (d) harnessing of incident solar energy, the most pollution-free power source; (e) methods of natural pest control, based on more complete understanding of ecological inter-relationships; (f) medical advances that would decrease the death rate; (g) contraceptive advances that would facilitate the equalization of the birth rate with the decreasing death rate.

As for the incentive that would encourage men to produce such technological advances, what better incentive could there be than the knowledge that a new idea would be translated into a visible improvement in the quality of life? Historically mankind's long record of new inventions has resulted in crowding, deterioration of the environment, and greater social inequality because greater productivity has been absorbed by population and capital growth. There is no reason why higher productivity could not be translated into a higher standard of living or more leisure or more pleasant surroundings for everyone, if these goals replace growth as the primary value of society.

Equality in the Equilibrium State

One of the most commonly accepted myths in our present society is the promise that a continuation of our present patterns of growth will lead to greater equality. It has been demonstrated, however, that present patterns of population and capital growth are actually increasing the gap between the rich and the poor on a world-wide basis, and that the ultimate result of a continued attempt to grow according to the present pattern will be a disastrous collapse.

The greatest possible impediment to more equal distribution of the world's resources is population growth. It seems to be a universal observation, regrettable but understandable, that as the number of people over whom a fixed resource must be distributed increases, the equality of distribution decreases. Equal sharing becomes social suicide if the average amount available per person is not enough to maintain life. FAO studies of food distribution have actually documented this general observation. Analysis of distribution curves shows that when the food supplies of a group diminish, inequalities in intake are accentuated, while the number of undernourished families increases more than in proportion to the deviation from the mean. Moreover, the food intake deficit grows with the size of households so that large families, and their

children in particular, are statistically the most likely to be underfed.²

In a long-term equilibrium state, the relative levels of population and capital, and their relationships to fixed constraints such as land, fresh water, and mineral resources, would have to be set so that there would be enough food and material production to maintain everyone at (at least) a subsistence level. One barrier to equal distribution would thus be removed. Furthermore, the other effective barrier to equality—the promise of growth—could no longer be maintained, as Dr Herman E. Daly has pointed out. “For several reasons the important issue of the stationary state will be distribution, not production. The problem of relative shares can no longer be avoided by appeals to growth. The argument that everyone should be happy as long as his absolute share of wealth increases, regardless of his relative share, will no longer be available . . . The stationary state would make fewer demands on our environmental resources, but much greater demands on our moral resources.”³

There is, of course, no assurance that humanity's moral resources would be sufficient to solve the problems of income distribution, even in an equilibrium state. However, there is even less assurance that such social problems will be solved in the present state of growth, which is straining both the moral and the physical resources of the world's people.

The picture of the equilibrium state we have drawn here is idealized, to be sure. It may be impossible to achieve in the form described here, and it may not be the form most people on earth would choose. The only purpose in describing it at all is to emphasize that global equilibrium need not mean an end to progress or human development. The possibilities within an equilibrium state are almost endless.

An equilibrium state would not be free of pressures, since no society can be free of pressures. Equilibrium would require trading certain human freedoms, such as producing unlimited numbers of children or consuming uncontrolled amounts of resources, for other freedoms, such as relief from pollution and crowding and the threat of collapse of the world system. It is possible that new freedoms might also arise—universal and unlimited education, leisure for creativity and inventiveness, and, most important of all, the freedom from hunger and poverty enjoyed by such a small fraction of the world's people today.

The transition from growth to global equilibrium

We can say very little at this point about the practical, day-by-day steps that might be taken to reach a desirable, sustainable state of global equilibrium. Our thoughts have not been developed in sufficient detail to understand all the implications of the transition from growth to equilibrium. Before any part of the world's society embarks delibe-

rately on such a transition, there must be much more discussion, more extensive analysis, and many new ideas contributed by many different people. If we stimulate each reader to begin pondering how such a transition might be carried out, we shall have accomplished our immediate goal.

Certainly much more information is needed to manage the transition to global equilibrium. The most glaring deficiencies in present knowledge occur in the pollution sector. How long does it take for any given pollutant to travel from its point of release to its point of entrance into the human body? Does the time required for the processing of any pollutant into harmful form depend on the level of pollutant? Do several different pollutants acting together have a synergistic effect on human health? What are the long-term effects of low-level dosages on humans and other organisms? There is also a need for more information about rates of soil erosion and land wastage under intensified modern agricultural practices.

From our own vantage point as systems analysts, of course, we would recommend that the search for facts not be random but be governed by a steadily increased emphasis on establishing system structure. The behavior of all complicated social systems is primarily determined by the web of physical, biological, psychological, and economic relationships that binds together any human population, its natural environment, and its economic activities. Until the underlying structures of our socio-economic systems are thoroughly analyzed, they cannot be managed effectively, just as an automobile cannot be maintained in good running condition without a knowledge of how its many parts influence each other. Studies of system structure may reveal that the introduction into a system of some simple stabilizing feedback mechanism will solve many difficulties. There have been interesting suggestions along that line already—for example, that the total costs of pollution and resource depletion be included in the price of a product, or that every user of river water be required to place his intake pipe downstream from his effluent pipe.

The final, most elusive, and most important information we need deals with human values. As soon as a society recognizes that it cannot maximize everything for everyone, it must begin to make choices. Should there be more people or more wealth, more wilderness or more automobiles, more food for the poor or more services for the rich? Establishing the correct answers to questions like these and translating those answers into policy is the essence of the political process. Yet few people in any society even realize that such choices are being made every day, much less ask themselves what their own choice would be. The equilibrium society will have to weigh the trade-offs engendered by a finite earth not only with a consideration of present human values but

also with a consideration of future generations. To do that, society will need better means than exist today for clarifying the realistic alternatives available, for establishing social goals, and for achieving the alternatives that are most consistent with those goals. But most important of all, long-term goals must be specified and short-term goals made consistent with them.

Although we underline the need for more study and discussion of these difficult questions, we end on a note of urgency. We hope that intensive study and debate will proceed simultaneously with an ongoing program of action. The details are not yet specified, but the general direction for action is obvious. Enough is known already to analyze many proposed policies in terms of their tendencies to promote or to regulate growth. Numerous nations have adopted or are considering programs to stabilize their populations. Some localized areas are also trying to reduce their rates of economic growth.⁴ These efforts are weak at the moment, but they could be strengthened very quickly if the goal of equilibrium were recognized as desirable and important by any sizable part of human society.

We have repeatedly emphasized the importance of the natural delays in the population-capital system of the world. These delays mean, for example, that if Mexico's birth rate gradually declined from its present value to an exact replacement value by the year 2000, the country's population would continue to grow until the year 2060. During that time the population would grow from 50 million to 130 million.⁵ If the United States population had two children per family starting now and if there were no new immigration, the population would still continue to grow until the year 2037, and it would increase from 200 million to 266 million.⁶ If world population as a whole reached a replacement-size family by the year 2600 (at which time the population would be 5.8 billion), the delays caused by the age structure would result in a final leveling-off of population at 8.2 billion⁷ (assuming that the death rate would not rise before then—an unlikely assumption, according to available evidence).

Taking no action to solve these problems is equivalent to taking wrong action. Every day of continued exponential growth brings the world system closer to the ultimate limits to that growth. A decision to do nothing is a decision to increase the risk of collapse. We cannot say with certainty how much longer mankind can postpone instituting deliberate control of his growth before he will have lost the chance for control. We suspect on the basis of present knowledge of the physical constraints of the planet that the growth phase cannot continue for another one hundred years. Again, because of the delays in the system, if the global society waits until these constraints are unmistakably apparent, it will have waited too long.

If there is cause for deep concern, there is also cause for hope. Deliberately limiting growth would be difficult, but not impossible. The way to proceed is clear, and the necessary steps, although they are new ones for human society, are well within human capabilities. Man possesses, for a small moment in his history, the most powerful combination of knowledge, tools and resources the world has ever known. He has all that is physically necessary to create a totally new form of human society—one that would be built to last for generations. The two missing ingredients are a realistic, long-term goal that can guide mankind to the equilibrium society and the human will to achieve that goal. Without such a goal and a commitment to it, short-term concerns will generate the exponential growth that drives the world system toward the limits of the earth and ultimate collapse. With the goal and that commitment, mankind would be ready now to begin a controlled, orderly transition from growth to global equilibrium.

© COPYRIGHT DENNIS L. MEADOWS. Excerpted from chapter 3 of *The Limits to Growth* (Bantam Island Limited, London, 1972).

1. John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, in *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, ed. V.W. Bixler and J.M. Robson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), p. 734.

2. Bertrand Russell, in *Primer of Ideology and Other Essays* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1933), pp. 14-15.

3. UN Food and Agriculture Organization, *Provisional Indicative World Plan for Agricultural Development* 2-493.

4. Herman E. Daly, 'Toward a Stationary-State Economy', in *The Further Earth*, ed. John Marie and Robert Rothenow (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), pp. 204-17.

5. See, for example, 'Pollen Antareses Keep Out' *Forbes*, June 13, 1971, p. 22, and *The Economist*, January 1972.

6. J. Douglass Piche and St-Albert Talbot, 'Un Taux d'accroissement nul pour les pays en voie de développement en l'an 2000: Révision réaliste?', *Population* 25 (Septembre/Décembre 1970): 977.

7. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, *An Interim Report to the President and the Congress* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1971).

8. Bernard Brodwin, *The Population Council Report Annual Report, 1970* (New York: The Population Council, 1970), p. 19.

Peace research: the radical critique

MICHAEL D. WALLACE

SINCE IT WAS FIRST COINED, THE TERM 'peace research' has embraced the intellectual activities of an extremely heterogeneous group of men and women. Peace researchers vary widely in their intellectual training, methodological perspectives and research interests, as well as in their personal values and political beliefs. Traditionally this diversity has proven to be an asset rather than a liability; instead of generating schisms over points of ideological or methodological orthodoxy, it has resulted in a pooling of expertise, ideas and points of view which has markedly advanced our collective understanding of conflict, war and peace. This happy result has been due to the strength of purpose that guided the inquiry. Given the continuing threat of nuclear annihilation in the contemporary era, whatever differences existed were not considered to be as important as the common goal of generating rigorous knowledge which would reduce the dangers of unprecedented destruction and loss of life that might result from large-scale conflict in the international system or its subsystems. Disagreements within the discipline have for this reason remained well within the traditional conception of scholarly discourse, and it was not questioned on any side that the purpose of such controversy was to clarify the intellectual task at hand and assist in its execution.

However, recent debates amongst peace researchers have raised serious doubts about the continued ability of this common purpose to unify the discipline, or whether indeed such agreement exists any longer. Some scholars have begun to raise questions challenging the present orientation of peace research which are couched in the rhetoric of politics and ideology. In doing so, they frequently appeal to the philosophical differences which separate peace-oriented scholars from one another rather than to the goal which supposedly unites them. These criticisms—generally referred to as 'the radical critique of peace research'—have sparked an intense debate within the discipline which has gone a fair way to

needs any feeling of shared goals amongst peace researchers of different nationalities and political persuasions.

Many peace researchers have been quick to assume that this debate represents a integrative development, and that the new criticism, if heeded, would seriously undermine what has been accomplished so far. According to this view, the issue is a simple one, the radical critics, in judging peace research by their own political standards, have betrayed the aims of the discipline. They have abandoned internationalism in favour of a narrowly partisan view of the world's conflicts; abandoned neutrality for ideological fervour, and abandoned intellectual inquiry to engage in political advocacy. If they were to be taken seriously, the result would be the fragmentation of peace research with different factions sniping at one another from behind barricades of ideological *partis pris*. From this perspective, the issues raised by the radical critique are not really matters for scholarly debate at all.

However, it may well be that this appraisal represents more a reaction to the language and tone of the radical critique than an evaluation of the arguments being presented. If these are carefully examined, it becomes clear that it is very misleading to interpret the debate as a confrontation between the traditional 'scholarly' approach seeking to uphold the goals of peace research and a new 'political' one concerned with an entirely new set of priorities. The radical scholars do not seem to be abandoning the old goals so much as challenging the way these have been interpreted and implemented by a large number of their colleagues. From their point of view, it is 'traditional' peace research which constitutes a betrayal.

If this interpretation is accurate then it does our cause no service to dismiss the radical viewpoint out of hand, or to treat the issues involved as essentially irrelevant to scholarly activity. Given the changes that have taken place in both the world situation and our own cognitive maps since the objects and strategies of peace research were originally formulated, we should scarcely be surprised if some degree of re-orientation and re-direction were necessary. And if the underpinnings of our discipline are in fact shaky in some respects, now is the time to make the necessary modifications; the poverty of the present world situation scarcely permits us the luxury of discovering our mistakes in the future of time. In other words, the radical critique may not be an irrelevant distraction but a valuable opportunity to reassess our progress and prospects, and for this reason it seems well worth while to undertake a systematic examination of the main issues in the debate. This paper is a modest beginning in this direction.

Although the new criticism of peace research touch upon a variety of matters, here we will deal only with what seem to be the four central complaints: (a) that most peace research is trivial or irrelevant to the real

problems of peace and war, (b) that the discipline has a pro-American bias, (c) that it is oriented towards maintaining the status quo, and (d) that it takes a narrow and one-sided view of violence. What validity do these charges have, and what are their implications for the development of the discipline?

KNOWLEDGE VS ACTION

Perhaps the most frequent charge made by the radicals against peace research is that the activities of the discipline are irrelevant to the problems of peace and war. According to this view, we have quite sufficient knowledge to achieve peace already, everything from disarmament plans to economic schemes for re-tooling war industries to international legal codes have been worked out already (Rapoport, 1970). What is needed is action to implement the knowledge we have.

In one sense, this claim misses the point entirely. The task facing peace research is not and has never been merely that of devising the technical arrangements for a smooth transition to a warless world. The problem is, rather, to identify the substantive obstacles to this transition and to determine in what ways they may be removed or neutralized. Thus, it is misleading to liken the present position of peace research to that of a doctor with a vaccine but no staff to administer it (Rapoport, 1970, p. 379). Perhaps a more accurate analogy would be of the medical researcher who has a vaccine that works, but only on monkeys. To be sure, we would have a solution to the problem of war if only nation-states behaved differently than they do in fact. But the researcher would be ridiculed if his 'solution' was to argue that men would react like apes if only we were diligent enough in persuading them to do so.² Since homo sapiens is indeed a distinct species and since nation-states show little inclination to change in the right ways of their own volition, we are still left with the problem of getting from where we are to where we really want to be. Obviously we do not have enough knowledge for that, and indeed perhaps one reason for the anguish gripping the discipline at the moment is that many peace researchers are only now beginning to appreciate how difficult the problem really is.

But there is another and much more valid way to formulate the radicals' criticism. It is not that we have enough 'knowledge' and need more 'action' but rather that the urgency and gravity of the present world situation makes it vital that we marshalled our intellectual resources with a view to tackling concrete problems. Phrased in this way, it hardly seems an unreasonable demand, after all, the original concept of peace research was that of an applied discipline. But as some have pointed out (Schwartz, 1969), the discipline as a whole has paid too little attention to the difficulties involved in applying the evidence and knowledge we have collected to contemporary problems. Peace re-

searchers have tended to perceive their task as simply a matter of perfecting their scientific understanding of the origins of conflict and violence, tacitly assuming that the practical applications of this body of knowledge will be more or less self-evident.

Unfortunately, there is good reason to believe that this assumption is far too optimistic: in several important ways, the requirements of an applied science differ from those of a 'pure' inquiry, making it difficult or impossible to affix many police research findings 'as is'. This fact does not imply that we need or ought to abandon our scientific task of building or verifying models and hypotheses, and certainly not that social science findings cannot be applied to practical policy problems. On the contrary, our long-run practical success must inevitably depend on the achievements of our scientific inquiries. But to the extent that our work is to have short-run practical importance, it will be necessary to take these different requirements into account both in the selection of research problems and in the interpretations we put upon the knowledge gathered. Let us now turn to an examination of these differing requirements and the changes that might be made in our research strategies to meet them.

Theoretical generalizations and applied science

To begin with, there are two important ways in which the requirements of applied science are less demanding and rigorous than those of an inquiry oriented solely towards systematic description and exploration. The first point concerns the need to recognize the value of our own work. It is often difficult to realize that concepts, generalizations, and findings which are inadequate or incomplete from the point of view of our theoretical concerns may be entirely sufficient to deal with some practical problems (Kaplan, 1964, p. 404). Many illustrations of this are to be found in the physical sciences. For example, from the point of view of modern physics the gas laws, and the theory of molecular motion upon which they rest, have long since been found wanting. Nevertheless, they were fully adequate to enable engineers to build steam engines, if these men had waited for the development of quantum mechanics, we would still be using coals—*and it would be no easier to build a steam engine!* And, let us not think the analogy of the gas laws pressures too much on the current level of knowledge in the social sciences, it might be pointed out that the great Gothic cathedrals were built some two centuries before their designers distinguished between the geometric centre of an object and its centre of gravity.

Parallel situations may arise in police research more often than we think; we are sometimes so concerned with the underdeveloped state of our knowledge that we may pretend there is nothing we can say. Even the lowliest statistical regularity may help shed light on a particular

problem if an analogous or recurrent case should arise, if, for example, leaders and decision-makers could refer to a list of situations similar to the one they were facing which allowed them to determine the probability of conflict associated with each available move (Singer, 1979), the probability of conflict might well be markedly reduced. There will always be more to know and discover, and our theories and generalisations must be continually rendered obsolete as the discipline progresses, to use this fact as an excuse to defer their application it, in the modern lexicon, a cop-out.

The criteria for inference

A second respect in which the standards of pure inquiry are too rigid for an applied science is in the matter of the weight of evidence required for proof. For scientific purposes, the crucial thing is to avoid Type I error, the cardinal sin is making inferences for which there is insufficient evidence. But when it becomes time to apply what we know, both Type I and Type II errors must be avoided, so return to our medical researcher and his vaccine, he can afford neither to underestimate the probability of dangerous side-effects and expose the population to danger nor overestimate these effects and deprive people of protection against disease.

In the social sciences, this problem of the standards of proof arises primarily in the treatment of statistical regularities. It has become the convention to discount any such observed regularity unless it has less than a 5 per cent probability of occurring by chance alone, if this probability is greater than .05, the evidence for the existence of a relationship is deemed 'not sufficient'. Now even if this procedure is adequate for the purposes of scientific inquiry, it is clear that a more Bayesian perspective is required when we come to apply our findings to practical problems (Kaplan, 1964, pp 236-237). If we want to obtain a conclusion between the implementation of policy X at time t and the onset of war at time $t+1$, it would be both misleading and irresponsible to inform a policy-maker that the evidence connecting X with war was 'insufficient' or 'not significant' merely because the observed regularity had a 10 probability of occurring by chance. It is important that we avoid allowing scientific caution to conceal or discard such important policy information.

The applicability of findings

If there are two senses in which scientific standards are too rigid for practical purposes, there are two equally important respects in which they do not go far enough. To begin with, it is not good enough to have a good explanatory model, hypothesis or theory. To be useful as a source of policy alternatives a model must deal with mutable objects

and explain by means of manipulable variables (Schwartz, 1969). If the explanation is couched in terms of units whose behaviour or state is outside the control of the actors involved, or if it employs variables whose values cannot be altered significantly by those actors, then it is of little practical value.

Perhaps one of the clearest examples of this divergence between the requirements of scientific explanation and practical utility is to be found in my own research. By measuring the divergences between rank-orderings of nations on several dimensions of status in the international system, I was able to account for a good deal of the variance in the amount of international war begun in the system from 1820 to 1964 (Wallace, 1970, 1971). Although 'successful' from the scientific point of view, this work has little value as a guide to policy. By explaining conflict at the level of the international system as a whole, the model imparts little information to policy-makers; it does no good to be told that there is an increasing probability of war somewhere in the world. Furthermore, since it is probably well beyond the ability of any single nation or group of nations to manipulate national status rankings, this explanation of war does not offer any ready means whereby conflict can be controlled. In order to bring these findings into the policy realm it is necessary (i) to specify the causal sequence of intervening variables, one of which may prove amenable to manipulation (Wallace, 1972) and (ii) to develop tests of the status discrepancy hypothesis as a predictor of national behaviour.¹

In other words, before many policy research studies can be used as sources of systematic knowledge for policy purposes, they will require a good deal of criticism and reformation. Otherwise, the policy 'implications' drawn from them are likely to be just that: vague conjectures and speculations whose empirical content is only poorly grounded in evidence.

The need for more information

A second need in policy-related studies is for specific, contextual information above and beyond the general laws which can be applied to the particular problem. Although, of course, we must deal with problems as far as possible with reference to rigorous generalisations, we should not pretend, in our desire to move beyond traditional policy analysis, that these writings contain nothing of use. On the contrary, this 'soft' evidence can and must be collected and referred to in cases where hard evidence is not available on some aspect of a problem.

At the risk of some redundancy, let me stress that I do not mean to imply by this that there are 'things not amenable to scientific treatment' or that speculation and conventional wisdom are ever substitutes for scientific findings. The point is merely that all of our generalisations

are probabilistic, in any given case, the values predicted by the model will be a bit off, with an 'error' or residual term left over. From the point of view of perfecting our scientific explanation, the best strategy to reduce this prediction error is to include additional variables in the model. For policy purposes, however, it may be impossible to wait for such greater precision to develop, in the interim, it is better to account for the residual term actively than to ignore it. In this way, engineers took account of such factors as wear rates and wind buffeting long before these 'residual' but crucial forces could be rigorously described or their action explained. In similar fashion, it may be necessary to deal actively with such variables as morale, military efficiency, or social cohesion (White, 1973).

To sum up then, it is not a question of either doing 'pure science' or being concerned with practical steps towards peace, workable peace policies require scientific knowledge, but by itself this knowledge is not sufficient. The radical critique thus serves to remind us of something we all acknowledge but tend to forget in the arduous and exciting process of discovery: our efforts are undertaken for a practical purpose and it is well worth the extra thought and effort to ensure that they do in reality contribute to that end.

PEACE RESEARCH AND U.S. POLICY

Although the radical critique alleges that peace research is not sufficiently policy-relevant, it also asserts that such practical concern as does manifest itself is strongly biased in a pro-American direction. If one examines the policy-oriented writing in the field, say the critics, it is immediately apparent that almost all of it is written from a viewpoint which, if not always actively sympathetic to U.S. foreign policy, is at least not incompatible with the aims, beliefs, and interests of American policy makers (Denek, 1969; Caspari, 1969). In effect, the argument runs, a very large proportion of American peace researchers have submitted to the blandishments and financial inducements of the large American foundations and the various U.S. defence agencies (Schmid, 1968, p. 122), and have unwittingly become part of the 'systematic effort . . . to mobilize technicians, men of science, and intellectuals generally, in the service of capitalist and neo-colonialist purposes' (Denek, 1969).

Now to the extent that this view represents an assessment of the beliefs and inner goals of the majority of American peace researchers it is clearly false. First, there is no evidence that this group is generally in agreement with the goals and methods of U.S. policy, indeed, many unguarded advertisements in the *New York Times* and much financed political campaigning attest to the opposite. Second it is equally misleading to infer that more than a handful have become 'defence intellectuals'.

The connections between some peace researchers and U.S. officialdom cited to prove this allegation usually demonstrate only the contrasting efforts of these scholars to influence American policy in a more rational direction.

However, the very strength of this commitment to altering U.S. policy leads to a more valid point of criticism implicit in the radicals' charge. This concerns the implicit assumptions often made concerning the probable consumers of peace research knowledge. There is a very widespread tendency amongst American peace researchers to accept without serious reflection the assumption that their primary audience consists of the U.S. foreign policy elite along with its associated sub-official and attentive public. One indication of this assumption is to be found in the large portions of the field oriented almost exclusively toward the problems of superpower conflict, deterrence and strategy theory along with arms control and disarmament studies are the chief examples. Although the past decade has seen a gratifying shift from a 'we-they' cold war outlook to studies which take account of Soviet policy perspectives (Broadbenbaker, 1961; White, 1963), there is still an unfortunate tendency to ignore other national actors or to conceptualize them as 'pawns' (Russett, 1955). Moreover, even those policy-oriented studies which deal with other forms of conflict have tended to focus very largely on the alternatives posed for American policy makers, as for example have the vast majority of studies undertaken of the Second Indochina War.⁴

Of course, the argument can be made that it is as it should be. For one thing, the U.S. clearly wields a paramount influence in world affairs, making changes in American policy crucial to the success of any peace program. Second, the danger posed by the enormous American nuclear arsenal and vast military machine constitutes a powerful argument for beginning the implementation of peace policy in the nation controlling it. Finally, if—as surely most radicals would argue—the U.S. record of conflict behaviour in the postwar period has been worse than that of most other nations, it would seem only good sense to start there. Nevertheless, there are two important respects in which this largely American focus is indeed unfortunate.

Chauvin and bias

First, while the point has been made often, it is worth recalling that the very process of formulating policy alternatives is likely to lead to political bias when undertaken on behalf of only one country (Singer, 1961). From the viewpoint of a single nation, its own interests, beliefs and values are the 'given' of the policy process, while those of other nations represent variables to be neutralized or manipulated. Thus, no matter how generally beneficial the outcome of a suggested policy is thought to

be, if it is formulated so as to be acceptable to national policy-makers it must stress the maximization of that nation's welfare, it need be at the expense of others. Only when the examination of policy alternatives is extended to include all participants in a conflict is there a chance of overcoming this bias.

Of course, if the purpose of such inquiries is simply to re-direct policy towards the more complete fulfillment of purely national goals, the existence of such a bias would not necessarily be a matter for concern. But surely the whole raison d'être of peace research is the furtherance of the common goals and interests of nations (Galtung, 1967), the discipline is nothing if it is not international in orientation. It is disconcerting, therefore, that conflicts such as that in Indochina are regarded almost exclusively as American policy problems. It is rarely equally legitimate to turn things around and pose the conflict as a problem for Vietnamese policy: how can the DRV secure the withdrawal of the American military presence in Vietnam with the minimum loss of Vietnamese lives? The point made by the radical critics is that the one approach is no more "political" than the other, and that the adoption of the Vietnamese perspective in the conflict would not only have a salutary effect on our understanding of the problem, but might very well lead to more fruitful suggestions concerning the termination of the conflict than we have been able to produce thus far.

The optimal clientele

This last possibility leads to the second objection to the American-oriented character of most peace policy studies. It is not only that such a focus may bias our outlook, it is not at all obvious that studies undertaken from this perspective are more likely to further the cause of peace than ones aimed at a different clientele. There are four reasons why this is so.

First, implicit in much current policy research is not only the indisputable assumption that the U.S. is the most influential nation in the international system, but also that by and large it is the most susceptible to influence by the findings and proposals of peace research. While it is certainly true that American administrators and political leaders are more conversant with, and therefore probably more sympathetic to, social science than their counterparts in many other nations, the evidence seems to indicate that major social, political and economic forces in the U.S. stand in the way of the implementation of most peace policy proposals (Welman, 1970; Rapoport, 1970). At the very least, it is difficult to conceive of new initiatives being possible under the tenure of the present Administration. At the moment, then, the voice of peace research cannot carry further than those sub-class and amiable publics not committed to present policies and hence not immediately in a position to

implement any new proposals.

Second, as American focus grows the many small and jaded powers which stand to benefit a great deal from the findings of peace research. Many of these nations conduct their foreign policies under far less stressful conditions than do the superpowers, and for this reason are more likely to be amenable to peace research influence. At the same time, they often lack the facilities and resources to analyze their external environment in a systematic fashion, and are often forced to make policy decisions with only impressionistic data on some crucial variables. A well-established body of policy-oriented peace research knowledge, provided that it be truly international in character, might receive more welcome than we have tended to assume, after all, a disproportionately large number of peace initiatives have been undertaken by small and middle powers. Given the demonstrated willingness of these nations to make themselves useful in the cause of peace, it seems surprising that so few peace policy studies should have been directed towards discovering means to make their efforts most effective.

Third, in opting for an American-oriented policy focus, many peace researchers have tended to assume that the socialist nations cannot be considered as potential clients. It is important that we emphasize by our choice of research topics what most of us insist upon as a matter of fact: that the socialist nations as a group are inclined to avoid violent conflict, and that their thinking on policy matters is no longer dominated by a monolithic and impenetrable ideological system. If they possessed a more complete knowledge of the alternative policies open to them and the effects these would have on the international environment, resolution of some Cold War conflicts might come more readily. For example, even with existing knowledge of American and West European public opinion there is no doubt a great deal peace researchers can tell socialist policy-makers about which policy moves will be perceived by Western mass publics as friendly and conciliatory, and which as threatening or hostile.

The increasing decentralization of the international system suggests a fourth and final reason for de-emphasizing U.S.-oriented peace research. During the period when the Cold War was at its peak, not only was the Soviet-American conflict the most intense and dangerous, but virtually every other major conflict either was, or quickly became, linked to the superpower conflict system. But with the gradual erosion of superpower spheres of influence has come a decentralization of conflict patterns. Not only are fewer conflicts tied to the superpower axis, but the Big Two have to some extent lost their former ability to dictate bloc policy without consulting their allies. Under these circumstances peace research aimed largely at influencing superpower conflict patterns is no longer sufficient. To control conflict, it is now necessary to focus on

well as those other bloc members which may be capable of exerting some degree of influence on bloc policy, and to orient still other research toward the growing number of potential 'customers' whose problems and interests lie outside the Cold War system.

In short, the radical critics are probably correct in asserting that the policy concerns of peace researchers have become somewhat maladjusted. To the extent that these efforts focus exclusively on American policy and ignore other clientele, they will both seriously compromise the international orientation of the discipline and quite possibly pass up a number of promising avenues for the peaceful resolution of conflicts. To avoid these difficulties, peace researchers must face squarely the fact that the selection of clientele in policy research involves both scholarly and political choices, and concentrate on making these choices in a way that is consistent with the overall goals of peace research.

PEACE RESEARCH AND THE STATUS QUO

In accusing peace research of bias, the radical critique does not stop with the charge of pro-Americanism; for many, the problem is much more fundamental and serious. After all, a basic principle of peace research is the need to avoid national bias, and so, as with the 'knowledge versus action' controversy, it requires no fundamental re-thinking of assumptions to diagnose and correct the problem (Schend, 1968, p. 217). But there may be a form of bias implicit in the principles of peace research themselves, specifically a bias in favour of the status quo.

According to this argument, peace research is devoted to seeking the resolution of conflict by the simplest and most expeditious means possible. Since (i) solutions which involve the preservation and stabilisation of existing structures and institutions often appear less complex and difficult than those which call for their alteration, removal or replacement, and (ii) in the short run the implementation of proposed solutions to conflicts is very largely a monopoly of the power holders in these structures and institutions, 'the universalist ethos of peace research becomes operationalised into identification with . . . the interests of those who have power . . . providing the decision-makers of the system with knowledge for control (and) manipulation' (Schend, 1968, p. 229).

Once again, in so far as this charge refers to the political preferences of peace researchers, it is far from an accurate assessment. Obviously, many vigorously oppose the status quo both in the international system as a whole and within many of its member polities. Moreover, a large majority would probably view peace not as a matter of 'law and order' but as the creation of a situation in which change can take place in less sanguine ways. Nevertheless, it is true that the great bulk of policy-relevant peace research literature is directed towards power-holders or those close to them; indeed, the very use of the term 'policy research' or

'policy implications' betrays the extent to which an official chronicle is taken for granted.²

Now, given the basic principle enunciated in the previous section that policy studies inevitably adopt some or all of the values, beliefs and preferences of the clientele they are directed towards, studies oriented towards political elites will almost certainly become imbued with the values of the power structure. And of course the most important, universal, and for that reason unquestioned, value for these elites is the need to retain their power and privilege and to maintain the social, political and economic institutions upon which they rest. Thus, even though many peace research studies call for reforms or changes, these will typically be reinterpreted as necessary to the defence of more important elements in the status quo (Galtung, 1987, p. 2).

Perhaps the most prominent examples of this type of orientation are to be found in the various plans peace researchers have put forward for disarmament and arms control. Almost without exception they operate on the assumption that the chief problem is to avoid allowing any side to gain a military advantage, in other words, the existing distribution of capability in the system must be preserved (Schwede, 1970; Rathjens, 1968). Even when international institutions are located and strengthened so as to render a resort to arms more difficult, this is to be done in a way that would protect the existing material and other advantages of the powerful minority (Wright, 1954, Ch. 2). In addition, almost all such proposals allow the state to retain sufficient forces for 'police' functions; in other words, they allow political elites to enforce the status quo internally as well.

Morality and elites

Now there are three major objections to the adoption of these elite values, the first and most obvious is the moral one. If a given political system harbours blatant repression or injustice, or if a relationship between two or more nations is exploitative or inequitable, there are serious ethical problems involved in advancing policy proposals predicated upon the continuing existence of that system or relationship, however satisfactory these proposals may otherwise be. It is surely not obvious that the needs of those who are disadvantaged or oppressed are less urgent than the need for peace, and even less obvious that these needs can always be satisfied by an incremental modification of the status quo.

Of course, it is an article of faith amongst many peace researchers that there always exists a 'win-win' solution which in the long run will reconcile conflicting interests, if we are only clever enough to find it (Schwede, 1968, p. 230). But then, after all, is only an empirical hypothesis, and not a self-evident truth, given the weight of evidence that seems to contradict it in many cases, it is certainly unwise to pose such an

assumption as sufficient justification for avoiding the moral questions involved. Moreover, given the terrible human cost that the status quo often brings, it is not even obvious that solutions can wait for the 'long run'.

The point is, in many cases there may be no 'optional solution' to the dilemmas posed by conflict (Gilbert, 1970). If there is not, we must make moral and political choices regarding the outcome, and these may very well lead us to reject the politically powerful as clients. In doing so, peace research will inevitably become openly involved not only in the formulation of peace proposals but also in the political process whereby these are translated into action. But lest there be a tendency to weep for lost scholarly innocence, let us recall that this is an inevitable consequence of our growth as an applied science, it is surely better to determine by deliberate choice how we wish to be involved in the political process, than to feign detachment and have the choices made for us by default.

Is peace ethics?

The moral difficulties involved in tailoring our proposals to suit political elites are by no means the only ones, and in this respect the weakness of the radical critique is not that it goes too far but that it does not go far enough. Radical criticism questions only whether the decision-makers of certain countries will pay any attention to peace research. Left largely unexamined is the broader question of whether political elites *per se* are the best or only agencies for the implementation of peace policies. Granted, these political elites are responsible for most of the violence we seek to minimize and of course the state remains the *de jure* *ultima* of control and influence in the international system. But if, as quite often appears the case, state policy is very unlikely to respond to the proposals of peace researchers, it might be well to ask not only whether political elites are morally acceptable clients, but also whether they are really the groups best able to 'deliver the goods' as measured by the reduction of violence (Rapoport, 1976).

In other words, instead of focusing our policy prescriptions on national-states, their delegated agencies, or international organizations whose powers are derived from states, perhaps we ought to be paying more attention to the policy alternatives, strategies, and tactics of intra-national interest groups, political parties, protest groups, minority organizations, ethnic or religious affiliates, and trans-national cultural and political organizations. The purpose of such a strategy would be twofold: (1) to assist those groups and individuals who seek to curb state violence, and (2) to assist those who are not part of the state structure or its clients in obtaining their basic needs from the political system with a minimum of violence. There is no guarantee, of course, that an

emphasis on these groups would materially improve our chances for peace, but it is at least a possibility, given the singular lack of success we have had in influencing decision-makers thus far, it seems foolish to continue to place our eggs in the state's ample basket.

The adoption of non-state actors as potential clientele will of course generate new research priorities. First and foremost will be that of expanding the range of tactics and techniques available to these widely-differing social coalitions. As noted above, the existing literature on nonviolent action is inadequate in that it fails to set forth workable alternatives to violence (Kelman, 1968). If we are serious about minimizing violence in an era where more and more conflicts are becoming zero-sum games, a crucial need is for nonviolent ones. In a technological society there are no doubt many ways an individual or group willing to take the risk could make an illegal but nonviolent 'splash', and of course the past few years have amply demonstrated that the symbolic overthrow of cultural taboos or rituals is often as effective as any bomb in forcing consideration of group interest. Both of these possibilities provides avenues for further research.

But the range of important questions goes beyond mere protest techniques. A great deal of work can and must be done on the strategy of building political coalitions too strong for the state to ignore or smash. One key question, for example, is how under-privileged groups can best attract those within the circle of the powerful who may be willing to support change out of disenchantment or because they fear for the stability of the existing order. Existing research (Lerner, 1966, p. 37) indicates that the best tactic is to emphasize the dimensions of similarity between underdog and target topdog (e.g. 'student is nigger'), as is the potent tendency of some minority leaders to emphasize dissimilarities periodically for their cause. In broader terms, peace research ought to explore ways of systematically creating a 'subversive majority' as an alternative to violent revolution.

The end of the nation-state

There is another persuasive, albeit long term reason for the adoption of non-state actors as clientele, not only may they prove to be the most effective purveyors of peace in the short run, but they may help lay the foundations of a totally different sort of international system. Many would contend that whatever success we may have in the short run in dampening interstate violence, as long as the world is divided into territorial states, each with a monopoly of violence in its own backyard and in constant and unrestrained competition with others, massive violence is an ever-present danger no matter how well regulated the system (Singer and Wallace, 1973, Wallace, 1976). If that be the case, then the ultimate goal of peace research must be the replacement of the nation-

state system by some other sort of international order better suited to meeting human needs and less prone to violent conflict. Although even the basic outlines of such a system are difficult to envisage at this juncture, it would clearly involve a quantum jump in the number and influence of supra-national, non-national, and transnational actors.

It is surprising, therefore, that peace research has not seen fit to focus on such actors as a primary dilemma, except in the case of inter-governmental organisations. Since there is little evidence that the world's nation-states intend to abdicate in favour of, or allow themselves to be subverted by, the organisations they themselves have created (Singer and Wallace, 1970), it would seem that the time is long overdue for a complete re-thinking of our approaches in this area, starting from the assumption that other non-national actors must play a crucial role in any systematic restructuring.

Several research strategies suggest themselves. One possible approach would be historical studies of those periods where other forms of international structure were dominant, for example during the High Middle Ages. It might be fruitful as well to look at the impact of technological, social, and economic change on the nation-state structure so as to discern which groups are most likely to emerge as its successor. Finally, it will no doubt prove necessary to examine the behaviour and intentions of these new actors with a view to ensuring that they themselves will not resort to violence.

In summary, then, there is some substance to the charge that peace research has endorsed the status quo to further the cause of peace. However, it is not necessary to argue this question on political grounds; there are good reasons to believe that neither an immediate nor a lasting peace can be achieved by such a marriage. It is to be hoped, therefore, that peace researchers will begin to focus to a greater extent on actors who stand apart from or even opposed to existing structures and ideas, recognizing that they may represent less a threat to our goal than the only hope of its ultimate achievement.

THE ROLE OF VIOLENCE

A fourth issue—and, for many, the crucial nexus of the entire debate—concerns the charge that present-day peace research totally misrepresents the role of violence in human social relations (Nehrborg, 1962). Peace research, it is argued, begins its endeavours with the perfectly justifiable assumption that nuclear Armageddon would be an unparalleled human catastrophe. In dealing with this danger it was quite correct to assume that the maximization of human well-being necessitated the renunciation of violence between the two blocs. But with the relative decline in superpower hostilities and the rise of internationalized civil war and revolutions as objects of widespread scholarly focus, many peace re-

researchers have extended this specific contention into the sweeping judgement that violence is the worst of all possible outcomes in any situation of human conflict (Schmid, 1968). This more general statement, assert the radical critics, is far from being universally true. In fact, a very much greater degree of human misery may result from outcomes where starvation, disease, enslavement, or the 'legal' use of oppressive force prevail. Thus, they contend, it is impossible to justify a position which emphasizes the elimination of violence over the uprooting of poverty and oppression.

If the argument went thus far and no further, there would clearly be a good deal of common ground between 'traditional' peace researchers and its radical critics. Regardless of which of these evils represents the greatest source of human misery and death, both sides would concur in asserting that their collective elimination should take precedence over lesser human goals (Singer and Womack, 1968). Furthermore, if as many peace researchers believe, the roots of both domestic and international violence are to be found to a large extent in the poverty and oppression the radicals describe, then there would be a good deal of convergence between the two views in matters of policy priorities.

But the disagreement is far more profound than this. The real point of division centres over how poverty, injustice and violence are to be eliminated. Peace researchers, claim the radicals, take a simplistic, negative view of violence and thus rule out from the start its use to destroy the structures which maintain poverty, exploitation and repression. This is foolish and unrealistic, they argue, since those who are in command of these structures will simply not yield to anything but force (Moghadam, 1968). In some situations, violence is necessary to bring down or intimidate the powerful into granting the necessary social, economic and political concessions to other nations or oppressed groups. Here, violence or the threat of it is necessary as a bargaining counter to achieve equity, without it there would often be no way of checking tyranny and injustice (Neuberg, 1968). At other times, violence must be used to overthrow the old order completely, at least in those cases where the latter's corruption, stupidity and brutality make compromise impossible.² In either case, violence properly used is seen by the radicals not only as a means of abolishing the 'normalised' misery of the under-classes and under-dogs, but also as a means of eventually eliminating violence itself, since they argue that it is the upholder of the old order which generates both this violence and popular counter-violence.

In short, the radical critique denies that peace research can legitimate its efforts to reduce violence by appealing to the common good. Since violence can have a net beneficial effect at certain times and under certain circumstances, the claim that violent actions should not be undertaken regardless of circumstances can only be made by reference to (i) a religious or philosophical belief that violent actions are wrong in

and of themselves, or (ii) a personal preference for or interest in things as they are. Whichever is the case, it amounts to an attempt to cloak private bias in the mantle of universal principle, that is all the more dishonest when coupled with a condemnation of the sadists for introducing such biases into the discipline. Either such biases must be made explicit and the moral and scientific legitimacy of dissent from them conceded, or else the maximisation of human benefit must be placed ahead of the maximisation of violence where these two goals can be shown to diverge.

Now of course it is not difficult to make a plausible case for the opposite view that violence seldom if ever serves the common good (Kelman, 1968). Scholars have argued variously that violence fails to effect change in most instances (Wolf, 1969; Coser, 1967); that even 'successful' violence entails both short and long-run costs greater than any conceivable benefits (Srookin, 1968; Arendt, 1970); that far from diminishing repression, it only generates more (Kelman, 1968); that regardless of initial scope many outbreaks of violence may increase the probability of superpower conflicts and thus of a thermonuclear holocaust (Wright, 1963); and—most important of all—that there do exist alternative, nonviolent means of effecting the same change at vastly reduced cost.

But if it is by no means obvious that the radical critique is correct in its contentions, it is clearly true that these arguments raise two fundamental questions about violence—one normative and one empirical—that peace researchers have been perhaps too willing to ignore or dismiss with sweeping assumptions.

The moral dilemma

Not unexpectedly, the thornier of the two problems is the ethical one. Simply stated it is that: what price are we prepared to pay for an end to violence, or, alternatively, what price in violence are we prepared to pay to achieve other goals? While the policies and strategies that must be pursued to avoid violent conflict may be compatible with many other human accomplishments it can scarcely be doubted they will preclude others. Should this be accepted as inevitable or ought our zeal in reducing violence be tempered by a consideration of other needs?

Of course, it is easy to recognise in this question the echoes of a tired old debate, it recalls the familiar cold war accusation that the discipline subscribes to a philosophy of 'peace at any price', or 'better red than dead'. But in that debate, the values imagined against the abolition of violence were those of narrow nationalism, political partisanship and economic self-interest. What I am suggesting here (and what is implied in the radical critique) is that efforts to eliminate violence may prejudice important goals which we may be reluctant indeed to abandon.

First and foremost, it may be that the savings in life and limb resulting from a reduction or elimination of violence would be effected at the cost of other lives that might be saved or ameliorated by it. If we grant that the most important goal is the preservation of human life (Marlow, 1943; Bay, 1968) and if, as the radicals argue, the status quo leads to death and suffering from privation and disease, violence undertaken to alter the status quo might be justified as a life preserving force. The problem is that in some circumstances, all available alternatives may (directly or indirectly) involve loss of life. But each human life is unique and precious, what permits us to 'trade' some lives for others? Even if we concede that policy should always be directed towards minimizing the net loss of life (Singer and Winston, 1969; Galtung, 1969), there will still remain the question as to whose probability of dying will be minimized. It might turn out that a policy of reducing violence whenever possible will produce disastrous outcomes; we might, for example, end up saving the lives of soldiers at the expense of those of children.

However difficult the moral problem is when only bodily integrity is involved, it becomes more tangled still when other values enter the picture. Considering perhaps the most urgent first, it might be argued (Niebuhr, 1969; Jefferson, 1787) that periodic violence (or, perhaps more important, the fear of it) is necessary to the establishment and maintenance of personal freedom, in any age when technology is equipping both public and private bureaucracies with ever more effective means of surveillance and control, can we really afford to abandon any weapon we might need to use against them? It is surely not outrageous to ask if a few lives lost to violence—at least if they are those of politicians and officials—are not a reasonable price to pay for a tolerable context for all.

A third goal whose achievement may not always be compatible with the complete elimination of violence is human dignity or self-respect. Many have stressed the debilitating and even destructive effects that social prejudice and contempt have upon a judged 'inferior', and insist that the custom—and the damage—of prejudice can only be erased by violence (Faison, 1961). If so, is it not at least questionable whether the elimination of all violence is the first priority?

A fourth and final goal that may be difficult to reconcile with an end to violent conflict at the present time is that of equality. Quite apart from the effects it may have on dignity and life-span, the existence of material well-being and opportunity constitutes a major barrier to human comfort, security and self-fulfilment. Once again, if violence represents the only way at present in which this inequality can be controlled or reduced, on what basis can we say that violence was chosen in error?

Now obviously neither peace researchers nor other critics can give final answers to these questions, nor should they. Ideally, the final

moral decisions concerning what is to be achieved and what is to be sacrificed should be made by all individuals whose lives are affected by them, and at any rate certainly not by Olympian observers. It is therefore incumbent upon peace researchers not to present the world with recipes or strategies in which these moral decisions have already been made implicitly or explicitly. Rather, they should concentrate on maximizing the knowledge and information the actors possess about all the gains and losses associated with all the possible outcomes. The individual actor can (and usually should) participate vigorously in the process of choosing amongst them, but in simple honesty he cannot misrepresent the choices involved, or worse yet, pretend that no choices exist.

The empirical problem

Now obviously the radicals' moral claim concerning the justifiability of violence is predicated upon a set of empirical assumptions about its efficacy. And no doubt the chief reason why most peace researchers have paid little attention to these moral issues is precisely because they deny the veracity of the radical model of violence and its effects. If violent actions almost never achieve their goals or if they are always more costly than equally effective nonviolent means of goal attainment, then it is scarcely possible to question the morality and honesty of attempts to reduce or eliminate violence.

The problem is that there still exists no conclusive body of evidence which demonstrates that the radical model of violence is in error and that the peace research model is correct. Few statements made on either side of this issue are much more than plausible speculation, and almost never is hard evidence adduced to support the claims advanced (Jensen, 1966). On this issue, as on so many matters affecting social policy, statements are 'proved' either by unsupported sweeping generalizations or by the 'ransacking' of history to unearth cases which support the contention in question. In effect, both sides take their positions on the issue to be more or less self-evident, thus requiring little or no systematic empirical treatment.

But as the debate itself shows, it is very far from clear what are the effects of violence on human lives and values. Furthermore, for too much is at stake for the matter to be treated in a cavalier fashion. On the one hand, if the radical view is correct then peace research will have to give up its notion that the avoidance of violence is always the causal and moral course, and begin to wrestle with the complex ethical problems outlined above. On the other hand, if that model is seriously in error, then it is the plain duty of peace researchers to marshal all available evidence against its growing popularity. In short, hard evidence about the uses and effects of violence is urgently needed, and while peace researchers cannot by themselves provide answers to the ethical issues in-

solved in the debate, their training and concern should make them the first to tackle the empirical problems. What then are these, and how might peace researchers deal with them?

The first major empirical concern in this regard is of course the matter of gains of violence. It is absurd to speculate whether the gains of violence are worth the costs unless it can be firmly established that there is indeed an entry on the credit side of the ledger. How important is violence to the achievement of human values? A partial answer to this question could be given by studying the statistical relationship between various types of violence undertaken by and for underprivileged groups and nations and improvements in their condition. Of course, even if a positive correlation were discovered, it would still be open to question whether the observed relationship was not due to a statistical artifact or the action of some other variable. Thus the test population must be sufficiently large to permit statistical controls: holding constant regime behavior, level of development, rate of economic growth, etc., is there still a visible relationship between violence and social improvement?

The second major question follows from the first: what are the losses incurred in the use of violence? How many are killed as a direct consequence, and how many die indirectly as a result of wounds, disease and starvation? How much freedom, dignity, well-being and self-expression are lost as a result of these struggles? And—most important of all—what is the ratio of these gains and losses? Is violence on the whole 'cost-effective'? Here we are interested not in the correlation between violence and its beneficial consequences but in the slope and intercept of the equation given by regressing the losses on the gains. How much loss of value is required to produce a unit gain? And what is the partial regression slope once the variables referred to above have been controlled for?

A third set of questions concerns the manner in which cost-effectiveness varies both over the observational universe and with the indicators employed. What kinds of violence (terror, riots, armed clashes) produce the most favorable balance of gain and loss? Does the ratio vary with the amount of violence employed? Is it the case that violence only proves effective under certain conditions of social mobilization, maturity, or growth? How is its utility affected by the availability of other means to achieve change? And what influence do cultural and personality variables have? To answer these questions about the possible non-additivity of the relationship between violence and value, it will be necessary to conduct studies on the effects of violence using a large observational universe on a wide variety of indicators.

The fourth and last set of questions concerns the relative effectiveness of violence and alternative courses of action. Are threats of violence

as effective as violence itself? In what circumstances does violence produce better results than actions deemed legitimate by the political system? How useful have nonviolence or passive resistance strategies proved by comparison with armed struggle? If violence proves to be the only solution, what are the ways in which its benefits can be maximised and its losses reduced? And can any new nonviolent strategies be devised which will match the effectiveness? To answer these questions, peace researchers must not only compare the effects of violence with those of the appropriate other variables in studies employing historical data, but also use simulation to try and determine the effectiveness of nonviolent tactics which have thus far been employed only seldom in real-life situations.

Now obviously any rigorous answers to these questions will require a great deal of careful theorising and hypothesis generation, index construction, data-making, and analysis (Walker and Van Vaneveld, 1970). But the point is that such questions are no different in principle from those concerning the causes of violence and conflict, and will no doubt yield to the same scientific methods. This being the case, there is no reason why anyone—regardless of their position on the use of violence—should be satisfied with existing answers or scorn attempts to produce better ones. With such hard evidence in hand, peace researchers will be far better equipped than they are at present to assist those stretched in the brutal and complex struggles of the contemporary era.

CONCLUSION

The new debate over the future of peace research has made it increasingly clear that many of the comfortable beliefs and assumptions which peace-oriented scholars have held regarding the purpose and impact of their work on the outside world may be extended or salvaged. If the discipline is not to abandon its original goal of providing the insight and knowledge needed to create a more livable world, there will have to be a good deal of rethinking and reformulation of its basic premises.

This does not mean—as I hope is made clear above—that everyone must drop what they are doing in favour of something else. On the contrary, virtually all of the research activities peace researchers are presently engaged in are urgently needed to answer basic questions about the nature and role of violence in the international system. What it does imply, however, is that those who focus on the most traditional peace research problems must make room within the discipline for those who seek to supplement these with new questions and concerns. For their part, radical peace researchers would do well to remember that their own basic goals—an end to oppressive and destructive rule, the most equitable distribution of human values and in general the pacification of existence—could have no better intellectual servant than a pragmatic, activist and international inquiry oriented towards the 'detour

to death' (Maruse, 1966) that is the lot of so many. If the discipline has not thus far met the expectations of many, it is cause for further action and not abandonment of hope; nothing is to be gained by substituting rhetoric for science.

REFERENCES

- Hannah Arendt, *On Violence*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1958.
- Christina Bay, 'Politics and Pseudo-politics', *American Political Science Review*, V 59, No. 1 (March 1965), pp. 39-51.
- Henry Blaum, *Violence and Social Change: A Review of Current Literature*, University of Chicago, 1968.
- Herbert M. Blalock, 'The Identification Problem and Theory Building: The Case of Status Inconsistency', *American Sociological Review*, V. 31 (1966), pp. 32-63.
- Anders Brestrup and Claus Iversen, 'Demonstrations as a Source of Change', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1966, No. 4, pp. 323-341.
- Robert R. Bowie, 'Basic Requirements of Arms Control', in Donald C. Branson (ed.), *Arms Control, Disarmament, and National Security*, George Braziller, N.Y., 1961.
- Urie Bronfenbrenner, 'The Mirror Image in Soviet-American Relations: A Social Psychologist's Report', *Journal of Social Issues*, V 17, No. 3 (1961), pp. 45-56.
- William R. Cupary, Open letter to the Peace Research Society (International), November 11, 1969.
- Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn, *World Peace Through World Law*, (3rd ed.), Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1966.
- Lewis A. Coser, *Contestation in the Study of Social Conflict*, Free Press, N.Y., 1967.
- Lars Deuch et al., Resolution submitted to the Peace Research Society (International) Conference, Copenhagen, August, 1969.
- Franz Fanon, *Les Damnés de la Terre*, Editions Maspéro, Paris, 1961.
- Johan Galtung, 'Tragedy from a Sociological Point of View', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V. 3, No. 1 (June 1959), pp. 63-84.
- Johan Galtung, 'On the Meaning of Nonviolence', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1965, No. 3, pp. 221-257.
- Johan Galtung, 'Peace Research: Science of Politics in Dagone?', (unseen), 1967.
- Johan Galtung, 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1969, No. 3, pp. 167-191.
- Arthur N. Gilbert, 'International Relations and the Spirit of Tragedy', *Palestine Review*, V 60, No. 1 (Autumn, 1970), pp. 43-52.
- Walter Lard (ed.), *Problems: Some Basic Issues and Alternatives*, Seaborn Co., Cambridge (Mass.), 1969.
- Thomas Jefferson, letter to James Madison, Jan. 30, 1787, in J.P. Boyd,

- (ed.), *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, V 2, Princeton University Press, 1958, pp. 92-93.
- Journal of Peace Research*, editorial, 1964, No. 1, pp. 1-2.
- Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry*, Chandler Publishing Co., San Francisco, 1964.
- Herbert C. Kellman, *A Time to Speak*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1968.
- V.I. Lenin, 'The State and Revolution', *Lenin, Selected Works*, V. 2, pp. 263-361.
- Gerhard Lenski, *Power and Privilege*, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1966.
- Herbert Marcuse, *Free and Civilization*, (2nd ed.), Beacon Press, Boston, 1966.
- A.H. Maslow, 'A Theory of Human Motivation', *Psychological Review*, V. 50 (1943), pp. 170-196.
- Seymour Melman, *Prerequisites Capitalism*, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1970.
- Edward Mondlane, 'Violence: Not Whether But How Much', in George Vickers (ed.), *Dialogue on Violence*, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1968.
- H. Nieburg, 'The Use of Violence', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V 7, No. 1 (March 1963), pp. 43-55.
- H. Nieburg, *Political Violence: The Behavioural Process*, St. Martin's Press, N.Y., 1969.
- Antoni Rapoport, 'Is Peace Research Applicable?', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V 14, No. 2 (Sept. 1970), pp. 277-286.
- George C. Rathjens, *The Future of the Strategic Arms Race: Options for the 1970s*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, N.Y., 1969.
- Adam Roberts, *The Strategy of Criminal Defence*, Faber and Faber, London, 1967.
- Raoul M. Ruess, 'The Calculus of Deterrence', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V 3, No. 2 (June 1959), pp. 138-145.
- Hertha Schend, 'Peace Research and Politics', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1968, No. 3, pp. 267-272.
- David C. Schwartz, 'From Political Theory to Peace Policy: Notes on a More Structured Peace Research Process', *Peace Research Society Papers*, V. 11 (1968), pp. 43-46.
- Herbert Scoville, Jr., *Towards a Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, N.Y., 1970.
- Mulford Q. Soble (ed.), *The Quiet Battle*, Doubleday, N.Y., 1963.
- Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Harper and Row, N.Y., 1951.
- J. David Singer, 'The Levels of Analysis Problem in International Relations', *World Politics*, V. 14, (1962), pp. 77-92.
- J. David Singer and Paul Warten, 'Individual Values, National Interest, and Political Development in the International System', paper

presented to the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

- I. David Singer, 'Knowledge, Practice, and Social Science in International Politics', in Norman D. Palmer, (ed.), *A Design for International Relations Research: Scope, Theory, Methods and References*, American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1970.
- J. David Singer and Michael D. Wallace, 'International Organization and the Preservation of Peace, 1815-1964: Some Basic Relationships', *International Organization*, V 24 No 3, (Summer 1970) pp. 529-547.

Michael D. Wallace, 'Power, Status, and the International War', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1971, No. 1, pp. 23-35

Michael D. Wallace, *Status Insecurity, Physical Mobility and International War, 1820-1964*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970

Michael D. Wallace, 'Status, Formal Organization, and Arms Levels as Factors Leading to the Onset of War, 1820-1964', in Bruce M. Russett (ed.), *War, Peace, and Numbers*, Sage Publications, N.Y., 1972.

Michael D. Wallace and Gail van Ypersele, 'Violence as a Technique of Social Change: Toward an Empirical Assessment', paper presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba, June 1970

Ralph K. White, 'Images in the Context of International Conflict: Soviet Perceptions of the U.S. and the USSR', in Herbert C. Kelman, *International Behaviour*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, N.Y., 1965.

Ralph K. White, 'Quantification and the Crucial Intangibles', in Norman D. Palmer, *supra*, 1970

Eric R. Wolf, *Primitive Wars of the Twentieth Century*, Harper and Row, N.Y., 1968.

Arnold Wolfers, 'Disarmament, Peacekeeping and the National Interest' in Arnold Wolfers et al., *The United States and a Divided World*, John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1966

Quincy Wright, 'The Evolution of International Conflicts', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V 9, No 4, (Dec 1965), pp. 434-448

Quincy Wright, *Problems of Stability and Progress in International Relations*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1954

□ From the paper presented to the Meeting of the Peace Research Society (International), Western Region, at the University of Washington, Seattle, February 18, 1971

1. Throughout this paper, references will continuously be made to the 'radical anti-ques', the 'radical criticism' and even 'the radicals'. The reader should understand these terms as a convenient shorthand used to identify a set of closely-related opinions about peace research held by a number of different scholars. No claim is being made that they represent precisely the views of any single person, nor that all who would call themselves 'radicals' subscribe to them or any other opinions. Although some might quarrel with the use of labels here, the point is not really relevant to the purpose of this paper, which is not to decide what so-and-so 'really meant,' or what such-and-such 'really is', but rather to discuss the substance of these new opinions of the discipline.

2. Of course, such things have happened in the history of science. Lysenko's biology is perhaps the most recent case.

3. For a discussion of the difficulties such cases involve, see Black (1966) and Wallace (1971).

4. A good illustration of this is the collection of studies on Vietnam edited by Lind (1969) which has become something of a case *study* in this respect. Although the purpose of the volume may have been 'to chart out more thoroughly and systematically the alternatives which participants in conflict situations might adopt', virtually all the papers spoke to the problems of U.S. policy, and were only tangentially relevant to the policy problems of the other protagonists.

5. The only exceptions to this are the studies of nonviolent resistance to civil disobedience that have appeared in peace research literature (Roberts, 1963; Selby, 1963; Oakung, 1974, 1965; Katsura, 1968; Bessing and Iversen, 1966) and which are obscurely named as those without political influence. Unfortunately, these are not widely referred to numerically, but also tend to focus more on the strategy, history, and normative foundations of such science rather than on their potential applications. Moreover, with occasional brilliant exceptions, these efforts have lacked the rigour and social science sophistication we have come to demand from peace research.

6. The rationale behind this process is perhaps spelled out most clearly in Lewis (1977).

Looking into the future: 1950-1970

A BIBLIOGRAPHY

Roderick Soderberg, *Post-historic Man. An Inquiry*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1950

History is a short transitional phase of man's total development, in which instinct and intelligence vie with one another for dominance. Eventually intelligence will completely dominate instinct. When this occurs, man will enter the post-historic period of his development.

Charles G. Darwin, *The Next Million Years*, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1953

The fundamental features of the future will be laid down by over-population. A segment of humanity will always be starving because of scarce food supplies. The present era will be viewed as a past 'golden age' because the future will be typified by sporadic conventional wars between independent dictatorial provinces.

J.G. de Bois, *The Future of the West*, New York, Harper, 1953

The creative spirit of the West will produce a single world society. It could come into being through a major war or through an extended period of peace. America is destined to spearhead the transformation of the future, while Europe will be its active ally.

Harrison Brown, *The Challenge of Man's Future*, New York, Viking Press, 1954

There seem to be three possible futures open to man, depending on how he solves his present dilemma. The first, and most likely, is the co-emergence of an agrarian world in the aftermath of a major nuclear war. The second possibility is a 'completely controlled, collectivized

industrial society'. The third possibility, which is the most desirable and least likely, is a fully industrialized world in which everyone leads a comfortable and satisfying existence.

Robert L. Heifman, *The Future as History*, New York, Harper, 1960.

Blind optimism and trust in the goodness of tomorrow will no longer suffice. The challenges of tomorrow can be met only if a new philosophy is developed that recognizes and accepts the inevitable aspects of the future while trying to shape the other aspects in the most desirable fashion.

Fred L. Polak, *The Image of the Future: Enlightening the Past, Guiding the Present, Forecasting the Future*, New York: Ocken Publications, 1961.

The rise and fall of civilization is preceded by the rise and fall of dominant images of the future. Modern western civilization is dominated by negative images of the future. The greatest danger to western culture, therefore, is its lack of an idealistic image of the future. Man is in a better position to fashion the kind of society he desires than ever before, but without new images of an ideal future to guide his striving, his civilization is doomed.

Roderick Seidenberg, *Anatomy of the Future*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Man's basic dilemma is that while his traditional values are no longer appropriate to a society structured by the dictates of organizational efficiency, he is unable to change his values because his spontaneous creative impulses have been so severely limited by societal regimentation.

Arthur C. Clarke, *Profiles of the Future*, New York, Harper & Row, 1962.

It is impossible to predict the actual future in any details. The best one can hope to do is to delineate the general direction that development might take. In addition, imagination is as necessary for good prediction as is scientific knowledge.

Ferdinand Lundberg, *The Coming World Transformatio*n, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1963.

An analysis of past predictions shows that social predictions are in many ways just as reliable as predictions made for scientific phenomena. A theory of social prediction can be formulated by isolating those factors that make forecasts of socio-cultural change possible.

Jacques Ellul, *The Technological Society*, New York, Knopf, 1964

The future will bring a dictatorship of technocrats more oppressive than any man has yet experienced. Various aspects of modern life, especially the economy and the government, are rapidly becoming dominated by the technical orientation. This trend will continue until man becomes completely lost in his technological society and totally subservient to its dictates of rationality and efficiency.

Dennis Gabor, *Inventing the Future*, New York, Knopf, 1964

Our civilization faces three great dangers, nuclear war, over-population, and an age of leisure. If the first two dangers come to pass, man will know how to react. Should the Age of Leisure become a reality, man will be unprepared to deal with it because of its novelty. In the past half century he has made tremendous strides toward abolishing work, but he has done little to prepare himself psychologically for his new leisure.

Georgy Palocz-Harvath, *The Future Behel: The Future of Russia and the West*, London, Secker and Warburg, 1964

Both Russia and the United States are changing very rapidly as a result of new technological developments. As they change, they are coming closer together and their problems are becoming similar. Should they succeed in becoming less ideologically rigid in their politics, they might achieve a reconciliation and cooperate in facing the challenges of the future, thereby serving all mankind.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man*, London, Collins, 1964.

The greatest challenge facing twentieth-century man is the creation of worthwhile long-range goals. If mankind is to survive, it must rebuild faith in the future by specifying goals that everyone can strive for.

Kenneth E. Boulding, *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century*, New York, Harper & Row, 1963

Man is coming to the end of a long transitional period, and is about to enter the 'post-civilized' stage of his history. To reach his new stage of development he must avoid the following 'traps'. (1) nuclear war, (2) overpopulation; (3) exhaustion of energy resources, and (4) atrophy of creativity due to lack of existential challenge. To overcome these problems man should use all the intellectual resources at his disposal to create an image of the future, or a set of long-range goals, towards which he can strive.

Oswig K. Flechthaus, *History and Futurology*, Mannheim am Glan (Germany), Verlag Anton Hain, 1966

History is 'an endless Odyssey' of unexpected adventures and difficulties and the future is a continuation of the Odyssey with new and unanticipated challenges. However, due to the great acceleration of the pace of change, the future has suddenly emerged as an entity that is completely different from the past. Therefore, the future and its impact on the past and present become worthy of investigation. Though futurology may not enable man to manipulate what is to come, it will help him to anticipate it and thereby make it more bearable.

Harro Orosbekian, *Technology and Man's Future*, Santa Monica, Calif., System Development Corporation, 1966

Long-range social goals ought to guide future technological progress rather than vice versa. This, however, will require a clearer specification of just what type of goals ought to be striven for.

Nigel Calder, *The Environment Game*, London, Secker and Warburg, 1967.

Widespread utilization of the soil is not the most appropriate method of producing the food needed by the modern world. Agriculture ought to be replaced by artificial methods of food production. Our whole future way of life could be restructured if the land now devoted to food production could be used for other purposes.

Herman Kahn and Anthony J. Wiener, *The Year 2000: A Framework for Speculation on the Next Thirty-Three Years*, New York, Macmillan, 1967

Basically there are three developmental possibilities: (1) a peaceful, prosperous world with a good deal of arms control and political coordination; (2) a peaceful, prosperous world with no arms control or political coordination; and (3) a violent, troubled world often on the brink of a major war.

Stuart Chase, *The Most Probable World*, New York, Harper & Row, 1961.

The key to overcoming undesirable aspects of the future—unseen population growth trends, diminution of individual 'living space', spread and growth of dense urban areas and configuration of the arms race—lies in a rapid spread of mass education and systematic application of new and existing knowledge to problem areas.

Paul Drucker, *The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society*, New York, Harper & Row, 1968

Two dominant trends will emerge and help to shape the future society that is, far-reaching changes in technology will cause continued concern with production and productivity; and organizations will become a central part of society, thereby serving man rather than enslaving him. It seems, therefore, that the major tasks of the future will involve making personnel improvements in the social fabric rather than creating it anew.

Donald N. Michael, *The Unprepared Society. Planning for a Precarious Future*, New York, Basic Books, 1968

It is quite likely that two types of culture will emerge in the future: one for those who can cope with change and one for those who cannot. To prevent this kind of split, people must be better prepared for life in tomorrow's highly complex world. A whole new approach to education will be required.

Gerald Feinberg, *The Prometheus Project: Mankind's Search for Long Range Goals*, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1968

The need to create long-range goals for the whole world arises from two modern trends: (1) interdependence of nations, and (2) the emergence of a technology that enables a limited number of people to make earth-shaking decisions whose effects they are unable to foresee. General agreement on such goals might serve as a bridge between opposing ideologies.

Erich Fromm, *The Revolution of Hope: Towards a Humanized Technology*, New York, Harper & Row, 1968

We are at the crossroads: one road leads to a completely mechanized society, with man as a helpless cog in the machine, the other to a continuance of humanism and hope, to a society that puts technique in the service of man's well-being. To make the latter a reality, we must: (1) develop 'humanistic planning', (2) channel the general discontent into continual action and participatory democracy, (3) restructure consumption patterns, (4) develop a modern equivalent for traditional religious forms.

John B. Platt, *The Step to Man*, New York, Wiley, 1968

Man's greatest problems lie in correctly anticipating consequences, and in applying his intellect to concerted action that will effectively reduce his needs and tensions.

Stuart L. Udell, 1978) *Agenda for Tomorrow*, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1968.

We will not attain radiant cities unless our minds encompass the foundations of a radiant social order as well. Our ideas for cities, for construction, and for social justice must coalesce in a single, interrelated concept.

Robert U. Ayres, *Technological Forecasting and Long-Range Planning*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969.

The direction and rate of future technological progress depends upon adequate planning based on insightful forecasts.

John McHale, *The Future of the Future*, New York, George Brander, 1969.

When thinking about and planning for the future it is imperative to throw off the mental constraints that past traditions or ideologies impose. This is especially true when trying to create the single world community that the future requires.

Victor C. Perkins, *Technological Man: The Myth and the Reality*, New York, George Brander, 1968.

A world society can become a reality if 'technological man' becomes dominant by the end of the century. At present this new species is far outnumbered by 'bourgeois man' who has no comprehension of the modern world's essential nature and uses its technology for limited and selfish ends. It is the continued predominance of this type that threatens man's future survival rather than his scientific advancement per se.

Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock*, New York, Random House, 1970.

'Future shock' occurs when the society in which one lives alters its basic character so drastically that old behaviour patterns are no longer valid or useful. Unless man becomes able to overcome this type of shock by learning to cope with rapid change, any effort to plan for the future will be ineffective.

□ Selected and abridged from Wendell Bell and James A. Mead, *The Secrecy of the Future*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.

IN BACK NUMBERS

1969

January

William R. Miller : Gandhi and King—Pioneers of Modern Nonviolence

T.K. Mahadevan : An Approach to the Study of Gandhi

S. Varma : The Four Noble Truths of Gandhi's Social Philosophy

April

A. Controversy : The Meaning of Gandhi

Robert Payne : The Inheritance of Gandhi

Israel Do Sola Pool : Violence in Villages

Stuart Nelson : Caste and Untouchability—and Gandhi

July

R.R. Dinker : The Lokasaysa and the Mahatma

Shabari Bhattacharya : Some Reflections on Gandhi the Writer

Esme Wynne-Tyson : Gandhi and the God-Idea

S. M. Theari : Four Questions on Gandhi's Philosophy

October

Jayaprakash Narayan : Gandhi and Social Revolution

A. S. Deshpande : Gandhian Social Philosophy

Reedina Scherer : The Obligations of the Individual

B. Lytle : Gandhi's Personality as a Source of his Influence

1970

January

Donald H. Bishop : Gandhism and Dissent in America

George Lakey : Strategy for Non-violent Revolution

James E. Bristol : The Draft-Resist Movement in the United States

Johanna Bosch : Enkson's Gandhi

April

T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Adwaita of Mahatma Gandhi

K. G. Sanyal : Gandhi's Lovable Personality

P. Nagaraja Rao : The Gandhian Concept of Dharma

Lyn Seaman : Totalitarianism or Nonviolence?

July

Paul F. Power : Gandhi's View of Citizenship

K. Santhanam : Gandhi's Way of Life

R. R. Dinker : Dynamics of Ahimsa

Gene Sharp : Gandhi as a National Defence Strategist

October

Grant Code : The Gana : 1914-1918

James D. Hunt : Thoreau and Gandhi : A Re-evaluation of the Legacy

T. K. Mahadevan : Gandhi Study in the Seventies

T.K.R. Unnikrishnan : Gandhian View of a World Social Order

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

1971

January

William L. Richter : Gandhi and Language : Political Relevance for the Seventies

Stuart Nelson : Nonviolence and India's Independence

Ea Lenarh-Pawlowaska : Principles of Gandhi's Public Activity

April

James W. Douglass : The Resurrection in the Kingdom

James Warren Gould : The Alternative to War

H. S. S. Khil : Techniques and Tools of Gandhian Revolution

K. Gupstower : Gandhi's Views on Law and Justice

July

Gerald Hurrell : The Idea of a Mass Devotic Movement

Johan Galtung : Peace Research

C. N. Patel : Erikson's Gandhi

V. V. Ramana Murli : Gandhi and Nehru : Dialogue to Debate

October

Karek Khanna : Individualistic Trends in Gandhian Thought

Edwin King : Celia and the U. S. Civil Rights Movement

Charles C. Walker : Nonviolent Action and the U. S. Navy

Ramkrishnarao Velury : Gandhi and Technical Education

1972

January

G. Tucci : A Meditation on Gandhi
Donald H. Bishop : The Presuppositions of Nonviolence

Mandranjan Jha : Gandhi, Civil Disobedience and American Officials

R.S. Mohandhar : The Theory of Resistance in Ancient India

April

Symposium : India After Bangla Desh

Homer A. Jack : The India-Pakistan Crisis at the U.N.

W. L. Gargas Jr. : Thoughts on the Road to Stockholm

Marie B. Syles : Needful Basis of Violence and Nonviolence

July

Leola Mumford : The Pentagon of Power

James Warren Gould : The Future of Nonviolence in Social Change

R. R. Dheaker : Sri Aurobinda's Philosophy : Its Universal

James W. Douglass : The Yang of Resistance and Yin of Temptation

October

Margie Friedman : The Community of Otherness and the Covert of Peace

James E. Bristol : Nonviolence not First for Export

James J. Preston : Religion and Political Process in Gandhi and Tolstoy

GANDHI MARS
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

2/10

17/4

VOL.-17. No 4. OCT. 1973.

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

GANDHI MARG

DASGUPTA □ DEVDUTT □ DIWAKAR □ DURGADAS □
MACHWE □ MAJUMDAR □ MANKEKAR □ PATIL
□ RANGACHARI □ RAO □ SEN □ TYABJI □ ILLICH
□ UNNITHAN □ TRIPATHI □ BAHUGUNA □ HYSLOP

IN BACK NUMBERS

1967

January

V. S. Narayana : Some Reflections on Optimism
William Robert Miller : Violence and the Christian Ethic
Josephine Holcomb : Gandhi at the Round Table Conference
P. Nagendra Rao : Gandhi and the Hindu Concept of Ahimsa

April

Thomas Merton : Terror and the Absurd
Theodor Ebert : The Meaning of Nonviolent Resistance
Jerzy Sawicki : The Perspectives of Peace Research
Horace Alexander : Ends and Means in the Pursuit of Peace

July

Martin Luther King : The Causes of the War in Vietnam
John R. Roper : The Concept of Deterrence
R. R. Diwakar : Gandhi and Man in Evolution
Theodor Ebert : Nonviolence : Doctrine or Technique?

October

J. B. Kripalani : The Meaning of Swadeshi
Donald H. Bishop : Gandhi and the Concept of Love
Karem Monsoor and Martin Grotjahn : Racial Prejudice and the Indian Taboo
T. V. Parvati : Tilak and Gandhi

1968

January

Martin Luther King : The Crisis in America's Cities
Marie B. Bylen : Truth is God
Jagaprakash Narayan : The Outlook for Peace in India
Ralph David Abernethy : Religion and World Peace

April

Robert Steele : The American Dream Becomes a Nightmare
Bo Wismar : The Changing Ideology of Nonviolence
T.K. Mahadevan : Democracy and the New Generation
Noam Chomsky : The Revolutionary Potential of A. J. Muste

July

Maurice Friedman : Martin Luther King: An American Gandhi and a Modern Job
Mortford Q. Sibley : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Revolution
Stuart Nelson : Black Power and the Poor People's Campaign
Adam Roberts : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Resistance

October

James W. Douglass : Is there a Politics without Violence?
Geoffrey Ashe : Can Nonviolence Change Society?
H.J.N. Horsburgh : Nonviolence and Impatience
R. R. Diwakar : Truth and Nonviolence : New Dimensions

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

GANDHI MARG 67

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME SEVENTEEN NUMBER FOUR OCTOBER 1973

Editors

G. Ramachandran
T. K. Mahadevan

Editorial Board

R. R. Dinker
J. B. Kripalani
Jayaprakash Narayan
Abid Hussain
Vijayl Hari
G. Ramachandran
Shrinani Narayan
Bharati Prasad Misra
Radhakrishna
Devendra Kumar Gupta
T. K. Mahadevan (Convener)



Contents

Editorial	257	The yet lingering cares
Symposium	261	Towards a counter-civilisation
Ivan Illich	266	School: the sacred cow
T. K. N. Unnikrishnan	304	A gandhian perspective of social change in India since independence
S. D. Tripathi	311	Experiments in trusteeship management
K. P. Bhargava	323	Imperatives of education for liberation
Thomas Hyslop	329	Meditations on Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed—III

GANDHI MARG, 1957-1973, AVAILABLE IN MICROFORM FROM

Keesa University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA; 35 Mobile Drive, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4A 1B6; University Microfilms Limited, St. John's Road, Tyler's Green, Peter, Buckinghamshire, England

U ISSN 2014-4017

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CARD NO 75-47114

Rs. 7.50 a year in South Asia : \$ 2.50 elsewhere : postage Rs. 2.00 (R 1.00) the copy. Payment in advance. Publication dates : 15 Jan., 15 Apr., 15 Jul., 15 Oct. Complaints about non-receipt : (inland) within 15 days : (foreign) within 45 days. Remittances by bank drafts or postal or money orders only. Published by T. K. Mahadewan for the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 221-223 Dena Deyal Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi 110 001 and printed by him at the Kapur Printing Press, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi-110 023

Editorial

THE YET LINGERING CURSE

This is the curse of untouchability in India. It is an ancient curse. But somehow it has persisted through uncounted centuries poisoning and corroding life in India. This proves how deep the roots of untouchability have penetrated into the life of our people. Untouchability, however, is only the diabolical symptom of a fatal disease in the blood and bone of India. That disease is the caste system. We are sometimes inclined to look back into the ancient past and remember the concept of varnashramas dharma on which our society was structured, on the four broad divisions of brahmins, kshatriyas, vaishyas and shudras, and beyond them the so-called uncharted waters in which lived the pariahs. The pariahs were the untouchables. But as the broad waters of these four divisions of society rolled down the pathways of time, they broke up into hundreds of water-tight compartments, in each of which life was held in prison and which thus stagnated and poisoned. The result is the present caste system; and the roots of untouchability are deep down in that system.

It is some consolation to recall that from time to time great moral and spiritual giants broke through the iron walls of the caste system and held aloft the philosophy of love, compassion and equality for all men. We had first the Buddha who admitted the pariahs into the Sangha and then delivered a mighty blow on the caste system. From the Buddha to Gandhi we have had an unbroken chain of saints and sages who held out their hands to the untouchables. Among them, Ramanuja was perhaps the most courageous and uncompromising. He risked his life for the emancipation of the untouchables. But all these great masters, with only a conspicuous difference in the case of Gandhi, have come and gone, and yet the caste system, along with the curse of untouchability, still survives in India. Even in this year of grace 1973 the poison of untouchability creeps again and again.

Why do we say there was a difference in the case of Gandhi?

While other great masters held out their hands to uplift the untouchables, Gandhi identified himself with them completely. He did not merely preach the doctrine of compassion but made the whole of his life embody that compassion in practice. When he adopted a little parish girl as his own daughter and brought the child and had it on the lap of his wife, who had only four sons and no daughter, a shudder went through caste-ridden India. Gandhi risked his life again and again when he organized a mass movement for Harijan liberation. With Gandhi this was not a political issue but a moral and spiritual one under which no one in India could accept untouchability and still call himself a Hindu. Gandhi's aim was not individual purification but the purification of a whole people and their religion. Because of his colonial moral authority and organizing ability millions of Hindus stood with him and acted with him. That was how temples were opened to the Harijans and how drastic legislation was enacted by Parliament and state legislatures, removing every legal bar impeding the fullest justice and equality to Harijans. The Harijans now have full and adequate representation in Parliament and the legislatures. They are a power to be reckoned with in the India of today. The higher castes and the political parties are all now courting their support. And yet, alas, the caste system still prevails and untouchability poisons the life of our people.

Long ago there was an illuminating controversy between Gandhi and Ambedkar. Gandhi now stands out in history as the saviour of the Harijans and Ambedkar will always be remembered as the dauntless champion of the untouchables. Ambedkar told Gandhi that it was no use fighting untouchability alone but that the battle must be a straight and valiant one against the caste system itself. His words were 'As long as there is caste, there will be the outcasts, i.e., the untouchable.' Gandhi's answer was equally prophetic when he said that the whole caste system was nothing but one of graded untouchability, from the brahmins down to the shudras, and that if the ultimate of untouchability affecting millions of untouchables was destroyed the whole caste system would crumble like a house of cards. Both were right. Ambedkar was right in theory. Gandhi's task, however, was not to pronounce a theory however correct but to go into battle, taking millions with him, against untouchability. Untouchability was the highest common factor of evil and in the fight against it Gandhi succeeded in marshalling every section of the people. He thus enlisted without explicit commitment these millions in a battle against the caste system also.

When the upper castes joined in the struggle against untouchability, it became imperative that they moved away progressively from the caste system. The writer has personally witnessed this phenomenon in innumerable situations as the Harijan liberation movement gathered strength under the mighty leadership of Gandhi. The battle against untouchability

lay released untold moral forces in the country which were later harnessed in a straight battle against the caste system. Gandhi asked not for concessions to the untouchables but for atonement by the so-called high castes. The only atonement he prescribed was identification with the Harijans and a complete social integration between the upper castes and the untouchables. Unique transformations of character and outlook emerged in the lives of hundreds of thousands of people, ushering in a new climate of hope and fulfilment for the Harijans.

And yet why is the caste system still with us and why is untouchability causing its poisonous head to often in our country? This is the question we must answer without any equivocation. We cheered the Buddha and Ramana and in our own time we have cheered Dayananda Saraswati, Vivekananda and Sri Narayana Guru of Kerala. Are we engaged in the process of betraying Gandhi also? The truth of the matter is we cannot betray Gandhi. He is unbetrayable as he symbolized the truth of this cause. Harijan liberation is no longer a question mark. It is a reality. It has yet to be completed. We have no doubt it will be completed. But before that happens we have to do many things. We are doing some of them but not all.

The first thing to be made clear beyond the shadow of a doubt is that the future of the Harijans now lies in their own hands. They must develop more courage, determination and organizing ability. They must stand together as one man throughout India and insist on their rights. They have secured many rights but they must go forward and secure all the rest. This includes not only political, economic and educational rights but the right to have the door open for their complete integration with the rest of Indian society. Every taboo against social intercourse and integration must be removed by law and practice. Perhaps the Government is doing its duty more than the people. In the struggles for the capture of political power people have forgotten the basic challenges of nation building, among which the fullest liberation of the untouchables is the most vital. The upper castes will not be able to maintain the crutches of the caste system much longer. The time is therefore ripe for the Harijans to move forward in their last-ditch battle to liberate themselves completely. There are no insurmountable obstacles. Every Harijan child must be brought up in an awareness of his complete equality within the Republic of India. Perhaps the Harijans are waiting for a leader outside Government, who will not be swayed either by the goodwill of the Government or the illwill of the upper castes. We need today a leader of the Harijans from the Harijans and for the Harijans. Unfortunately the most outstanding among our Harijan leaders are inside Government and preoccupied with many other issues. We do not have even a Cabinet Minister for completing the steps needed to achieve the fullest liberation of the Harijans.

While thus the Harpists must strive for themselves with valiant courage and determination, there is a solemn duty cast on the other Hindu sections. We also need a valiant caste-breaking leader to emerge from them. Gandhi's greatest contribution against untouchability and caste came from his moral leadership. After Gandhi our most outstanding non-official leaders have been Acharya Vinoba and Jayaprakash Narayan. Neither of them has picked up the gauntlet against the caste system for a battle unto death to destroy this all-corroding evil. They have, of course, spoken and written against the evil but this has made no dent on it. At the moment the voice of Mrs Indira Gandhi is the most strident and compelling in this cause.

Recently the Sarva Sava Sangh held a notable conference in Sevagram. But nothing has emerged from it of any significance in this war against the caste system. There can be no *sarvodaya* with the caste system existing in society. *Sarvodaya* and caste are contradictory terms and yet we do not know how many of the *sarvodaya* leaders and workers themselves are completely free from this poison. Socialism and the caste system can never coexist together. One must defeat the other. Democracy can never function when caste decides the voting. Poverty is also inextricably mixed with the caste system. The lower the caste the greater the poverty. All this is known to everybody. Everyone knows but few really care. That is the tragedy of the situation. The total eradication of caste and the consequent disappearance of untouchability depend on the character of the Indian people. It is at this point that we realise the heart-breaking truth that character has seldom been weaker in India than it is today. But we must not despair. Each one of us must do our best. No one can do better than his best. We must go on striving without defeat. We must gather together those who stand with us and offer unyielding and continuous battle. We will certainly win because history is with us and the changing conditions of Indian and world society are with us. Let us therefore keep our courage, effort and hope alive and looking hard.

G. RAMAKRISHNAN

Towards a counter-civilization

A SYMPOSIUM

SUGATA DASGUPTA

DEVIJIT

R. N. DEWEKAR

DIBYADAS

PRABHAKAR MACHWE

R. C. MATHUR

D. R. MANERKAR

R. K. PATIL

S. RAMACHANDRAN

P. KODANDA RAO

MOHIT SONI

RADE-UD-DIN TARIQ

THE THESIS

- ☐ The quintessence of Gandhi's political philosophy is to be found in *Hind Swaraj*, the quaint little tract that he wrote way back in 1909. Neglected over the years, modern systematic scholarship has revealed it for what it is—as the authentic ‘Gandhi Manifesto’.
- ☐ Gandhi's central theme in *Hind Swaraj* is that modern technology is destructive of human autonomy and freedom and that the affluence and power it brings is not worth the candle. Instead of trying to keep up with the Joneses, Gandhi argued, India should celebrate the art of living within her means—in a word, practice voluntary poverty.
- ☐ Unblessed with Gandhi's long vision, generations of Indian leaders not only failed to heed his warning, they just did not know what he was talking about. Having consistently ignored his manifesto—although Gandhi continued to draw everyone's attention to it till his last breath—it was natural that we misperceived the target of his attack. In the rush, the meaning of his life and message became diluted and weak.
- ☐ Through *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi called upon India to reject modern civilization—nothing more nor less than this—and to return to her

proven ancient ways. A total cultural revolution—not just nibbling here and there—was what he wanted. Unsurprisingly, we gave him up for easier ways. The result—65 years after he wrote that prophetic book—is there for all to see!

- Can India yet return to the vision of Gandhi? Can she take an about-turn, unlearn her mistakes and make a fresh start? Can we all begin to lay the base on which Gandhi's dream of a civilisation may yet be built and man's wanton march towards self-destruction halted in good time?

THE DEBATE

Sugata Dasgupta

Orthodox Gandhians have two basic fallacies in their thoughts concerning Gandhi's prescription for social development. The first is that Gandhi had wanted everybody on this planet to accept a creed of renunciation; and that in order to reach his way—the gandhian way, so to say—one will have always 'to look back' and 'to return somewhere'. The truth is just the opposite. Gandhi had beckoned us not to the past but to a future society—a solid, rational system based on coexisting and coexistence. He had indeed enjoined us to look forward to it, rejecting in our stride the tempo-orientation of the so-called modern era.

There is no question, therefore, of going back to Gandhi. One has instead to move forward to him and, with him, to a pattern of no return—no return to the present suffocating, mocked social system. Neither did Gandhi call upon the hungry to give up their claims to a better standard of life. In fact, the 'minimums' of material goods that he had wanted everyone to consume have not yet been guaranteed to all people in any country of the world.

Although mainly concerned with Indian liberation, Gandhi's recipe was global in mould. I will explain what I mean.

The goal of all the countries of the world today, both of the developed and the non-developed world, is 'development'. Its connotation, 'norms', meaning and 'standards' are set by the so-called affluent countries of the world from time to time. High standards of living, accompanied by 'consumption baskets' constructed by big advertising concerns, provide the dynamic definition of this new phenomenon. Every nation, and every individual in a nation, has only one ambition today that is, to reach this goal anyhow and at any cost. Planners plan, politicians dream ideologies and social scientists supply formulae to help their respective clients to come as near the goal as possible. There is then

an all-abiding faith that the proof of human superiority lies in one's ability to reach this goal in the shortest possible time. Gandhi, despite the fact that he had no access to computers to arrive at any correct calculations, knew that the goal, viewed from the standpoint of the total resources available to mankind, was an illusory and unattainable one. 'Development' as we view it was therefore, to him, an oxymoron. Neither feasible nor desirable, 'development' to him was a new mirage: the modern man's most suicidal superstition.

The logic was simple. Development was not desirable because it was feasible only in a non-egalitarian, exploitative framework and not where principles of equity were practised. If everybody had a car, for example, nobody could use it. It was only when a few people had cars that the stem of 'development' had no function. This is true of refrigerators, televisions, air-conditioners, heating apparatuses and of all other items which go to make the basket of 'development'. For if everyone owns these perquisites, the gross national pollution—a product of these developmental gadgets—is sure to destroy everybody's lungs. If development is thus not desirable because it militates against the concepts of equity and is based on exploitation and classism, as a universal phenomenon it is also an unattainable goal.

The logic here is based on arithmetic. If 'development', as described above, has been possible in the USA, it is because of the fact that six per cent of the world's population have been using 70 per cent of its resources. Is it not impossible, therefore, for the 70 per cent of the third world to 'develop' with the 10 per cent of resources now at their disposal? Assuming, theoretically, that the world's resources are equitably distributed and every one per cent of people could use 'one per cent' of resources, how could they attain 'development' as we understand it today? All that can happen in such circumstances is to ensure that poverty is removed and a fuller life than the one that the masses, say in the third world, live today is realized. The poor everywhere could only then reach the standard of life that Gandhi had wanted them to achieve. No more and no less. Aiming at a 'no poverty' and a 'no development' society, Gandhi's design provides the only rational and realistic goal.

The world has, however, yet to realize the logic of Gandhi's arithmetic. It has yet to realize that the task is not regional but global. The only way to pull up the standards of life of all people everywhere or some people anywhere is to pull down the artificial standards of living of a few, including those of the 20 per cent of people who are the affluent of the affluent society. For these few rich, Gandhi had certainly recommended the creed of self-abnegation, while he insisted that the rest must get the maximum benefit out of the total resources made available to all.

Gandhi's logic of development should be the criterion for the success of the third world. But so simple an arithmetic is often so difficult to grasp. The non-aligned conference at Algiers has recently provided sanctions to all nations to keep control over the resources they own today. Unwittingly, have they not endorsed thereby the right of the six per cent of Americans to keep to themselves the 70 per cent of the earth's resources that are under their control now?

The gandhian design for the new society is based on hard reasoning. It is difficult, however, for an uneducated elite, which thrives on the strength of guns, bank balances, slogans and voting powers and not on knowledge and wisdom, to comprehend it. But the reality is bound to dawn one day. As various countries proceed through one crisis after another and as Watergates, Solzhentzovs, famines, food shortages, bloody coups and murderous inflation take their toll, the elite dream of 'development' will be shattered. The hot man will then accept himself, the masses will then throw their weight in favour of the new society. Through a no-poverty, no-development and less violent set-up, it will guarantee the good of all and help the weak to assert themselves in a bold new varivodya order. The present malaise afflicting all countries of the third world, including India, is due to the inability of the decision-making elite of these countries to understand the simple truth that 'development' is not—repeat not—a valuable goal. It is, on the other hand, a pernicious doctrine aimed at the systematic exploitation of the masses.

Decadent

Mid-Swara was written six and a half decades ago. But it vividly reflects essential aspects of the conditions of India today. In fact, Gandhi's prophecies have come true and his prescriptions have considerable contemporary relevance.

Conditions of India

To refer to some aspects of the exotic repository Indian polity—the culture of our people is indeed being poisoned by sensitive westerners and unreflecting industrialists.¹ The concept of economic man, the principal feature of which is 'high sensitivity and positive response to pleasure', or to affluence, has been accepted by the dominant elite in India as a social ideal, and is being sold to the people through powerful media of communication and large-scale politicisation.

Institutions, particularly in the ruling classes and the leadership, are getting relaxed. Moral decadence permeates the centres of power. The erosion of values is ungendered.²

1. *Mid-Swara*, 41: 91-95.

2. *Ibid.*

The quicker means of communication and persuasion are being used to corrupt the consciousness of our people. Gandhi was worried about the evils of railways.¹ But India today is exposed to many diverse media—radio, TV, films, paperbacks, periodicals, advertisements and publishing. These have accentuated the base nature of the Indian man. The anti-social elements can now fulfil their evil designs with greater facility. National unity, economic consolidation and inter-caste contacts and interaction between sub-cultures have no doubt been accelerated. But good works at a snail's pace. The new means of communication are growingly becoming disseminators of evil. They are the gilded indices of our prosperity.

Tyranny, hypocrisy, double-talk, double-think, open cut-throat, unwholesome competitiveness and unethical politics are rampant, the process is a rabel form having been inaugurated dramatically in 1969.²

Communal conflict and caste-antagonisms, of which the atrocities against Harijans is a painful feature, continue to disfigure the fair face of India.³

The English-speaking and the English-knowing people have completely enslaved India.⁴ This is part of a larger process, the process of rapid diffusion of middle-class values and the enlargement of the middle classes.

When Gandhi attacked lawyers and doctors⁵ (Gandhi off to his perceptions) he was perhaps taking them as representatives or forerunners of the rising middle classes and was warning at the dangers of the incipient process of embourgeoisement which, we now realise, is as inevitable a concomitant of industrialism as is urbanisation. India's political life, its pattern of production, its art and its social norms and its world-view have all been infected with embourgeoisement.

Search for renewal

Beyond giving a clue to the understanding of our problems, in *Myrd Swamy* Gandhi provides us with an approach, or the way we may handle our national and personal problems.

First, Gandhi wants us to recover our faith in our own civilisation. Not that he romanticised the ancient heritage of India, nor even that he was unaware of its defects. He simply wants India to stand in her own boots.

"India", he rightly says, "has nothing to learn from anybody else" so far as the basic philosophy of life and society is concerned and so

1 Ibid., 43-47.

2 Ibid., 59.

3 Ibid., 46-51.

4 Ibid., 51.

5 Ibid., 54-55.

6 Ibid., 44-53, 55. Gandhiji was an isolationist. He did believe in keeping the doors and windows of our house open.

long as we are not swept off our feet by the life-passions of others.

From this, it can be inferred (and, I think, rightly) that Marxism, Liberalism, Freudism and Industrialism—great movements in their time and a precious heritage of human civilization—cannot deal with the ailments of the modern age, particularly those of India.

Gandhi's approach should impart self-confidence. He points out to some unfading sources of renewal within our culture, history and ethos. 'We cannot fight westernism on its own terms and on its own grounds', says Gandhi.¹⁴ '... We must restore India to its genuine condition. . . . Although in our own civilisation there will naturally be progress, retrogression, reform, reaction, but one effort is required, and that is to drive out western civilisation. All else will follow.'

Psyche of our people

Further, *Myd Swamy* explains to some extent the psyche of our people in the matter of their response to injustice. Gandhi says:¹⁵ 'Peasants have never been subdued by the sword, and they are not frightened by the use of it by others. That nation is great which casts its head on death as its pillow. . . . The fact is that, in India, the nation at large has generally used passive resistance in all departments of life. We refuse to cooperate with our rulers when they disgrace us. . . . I remember an instance when, in a small principality, the villagers were offended by some command issued by the prince. The farmer immediately began vacating the village. The prince became nervous, apologized to his subjects and withdrew his command. Many such instances can be found in India. Real Home Rule is possible only where passive resistance is the guiding force of the people.'

This knowledge of the mind of our people (as described in *Myd Swamy*) is relevant today.

Having watched how our people are passing through the curious nightmarish experience of economic crisis, it seems to me that there is little chance of the Marxian expectation coming to pass, namely, that deepening economic crises will ultimately on their own create revolutionary contradictions, that the exploited masses will become so aggressively assertive that they will bring about a revolution of a type not contemplated elsewhere.

It appears, under the prevailing circumstances, that a revolutionary upheaval is not on the agenda of a people who are leader-less, amorphous and unorganized. Therefore, their strategy for action against the present authoritarian, unjust, immoral order, based in favour of the organized middle classes and the vested interests, can only be based on (a) passive resistance and non-cooperation and (b) the creation of indepen-

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 93.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 22.

dom control of power outside the formal framework of our polity, with a view to the seizure of political power by the people.

Gandhi related resistance to injustice and a movement for fundamental social change to the production of basic needs on the basis of a sustainable constructive program. This is *swaraj* and I think that it should serve as a hopeful alternative to the counter-productive process of sterile parliamentarianism.

Gandhi's prescriptions

Finally, Gandhi's general prescription for the attainment of a new society may lack the glitz or sophistication and system of conventional analytical approaches. But it can be a basis for the fundamental transformation of our society. For example, the following specific points (implied or explicit) in *Myself Swaraj* are worth considering while planning for a movement leading to the total transformation of our society.

(a) Discourage every process which enlarges the base of the middle classes and promotes middle class values. For this purpose, abjure English, reject the present system of education, abandon the present laws and legal processes, devalue the importance of parasitical professionalism and commercialization.¹¹

(b) Since industrialism is the mother of our sickness, its cross must be overcome. Under the present circumstances, we must resolve that as long as we cannot make even pens without machinery, so long will we do without them. In this context I do not agree that Gandhi rejects modern machinery in toto. He says: "I want to save time and labour for all. I want the concentration of wealth, not in the hands of a few, but in the hands of all. Today machinery helps a few to ride on the backs of millions."¹²

It is clear that Gandhi wants to neutralize the debauching, enervating and exploitative tendencies of machines. Consequently, the point implicitly made by the Editors, namely, the total rejection of modern technology, is not brought out in *Myself Swaraj* when read as a whole. Gandhi clearly admits that while he rejects all machinery, some machines will remain. Perhaps, the Editors' point is valid in a limited sense if we concede that Gandhi rejected machinery in a metaphorical sense. For instance, he said that the body itself is the purest piece of mechanism, but if it is a hindrance to the highest flights of our soul, it has to be rejected.¹³

(c) In *Myself Swaraj* Gandhi makes a plea for the gospel of love.¹⁴

11. Our writer has linked the whole modern system to the Spiritism. Its branches are represented by parasitical professions. *Myself Swaraj*, 11.

12. *Myself Swaraj*, 8.

13. *Ibid.*, 8.

14. *Ibid.*, 14.

and aims at replacing violence with self-sacrifice. He says that the central theme of *Hand Swamy* is nonviolence and he interprets nonviolence as self-purification and more self-purification.²⁸

I think this is essential today, particularly for the dominant leadership. India is slipping into anarchy under cover of individual freedom and rights. The collective inhibitions are loosening. This aspect of *Hand Swamy* is specially relevant today. If we could create social pressures or generate collective or community sanctions against the leadership, either by noncooperation or by non-cooperation, it would be a step towards health and sanity.

(4) We should know that this is a time for repentance, expiation and mourning, and there can be no indulgence whilst we are still in a fallen state and we can become free only through suffering.

Obviously, *Hand Swamy* as such is not a plea for the practice of voluntary poverty; of course, it can be so interpreted if we say that voluntary control of the use of modern machinery and living within our means signifies the voluntary acceptance of lower standards of living for the time being. Moreover, our rulers who have been saddled with power and affluence should practise voluntary poverty and abjure violence in every form. Our people are simply condemned to wallow in poverty for a long time to come.

In short, as explicitly made out, *Hand Swamy* is a brief but comprehensive examination of the conditions of India, of what should be our approach to deal with our sickness and what specific and broad lines of action should be followed to build a new society.

Prospects

Finally can India return to the vision of Gandhi? I think, is uncertain, Gandhi's vision is practical and feasible. It is in tune with the compulsions of our age and its long-term problems. The consequences of the application of modern technology on a massive scale are forcing the people to accept the basis of Gandhi's vision, of which limited industrialisation is an essential component.

Several states in the USA are beginning to prefer slower development and a lower standard of affluence to excessive modern technology. Public opinion is swinging in favour of human and manageable scale of organization.

Even in India, Goa has shown courage and a sense of realism. While there is a scramble among the other states for industrial projects, Goa has turned down the Centre's proposal for setting up a thermal power plant there. Not that Goa is not power hungry, but ecological considerations have weighed with the state in rejecting the lucrative proposition. Earlier, Goa had rejected the Centre's offer to loan a

²⁸ Ibid. 2.

large refinery and fertilizer complex on similar and similar grounds.

There is also a growing general awareness of the hazards of rapid and large-scale industrialization. One may therefore hope that given effort, education and a greater ecological consciousness, a more favourable climate will be created for the implementation of Gandhi's vision.

Moreover, except for limited urbanization, the periodic and unwholesome contact with corrupt politicians and the exposure of a cross-section of the people to radio etc., a majority of our people are still, in a sense, outside the contact in which a fraction of our populace—the rising middle classes, the vested interests and the nouveau riche—are fiercely engaged. The majority of our people still live in socially closed communities, untouched by administrators, policemen and politicians. They are outside the formal framework established by the ruling elite in India. Consequently the soil is virgin and the opportunities are large.

It is an over-simplification to say that modern technology is the root cause of our troubles. We cannot fix the responsibility on impersonal forces of westernization. The question is who fosters this technology. The question is who promotes westernization.

Our rulers, in implicit conspiracy with their counterparts in other countries, are against self-reliance, self-rule and self-definition. Themselves products of a set of bastardly forces, they are out to foist on the nation a bastard culture.

Hence the basic problem is how to deal with these usurpers—the anti-people forces.¹ And even for this *Mand Swayam* has an answer—non-cooperation and building centres of power outside the present institutional framework.

R. R. Diwakar

I belong to the generation which has gone through the Swadeshi Movement of 1905-09, the Home Rule or Swarajya Movement of 1914-1920, and the Nonviolent Non-cooperation Movement of 1921-46. All these were instrumental in mass awakening and mass action and in bringing independence to India in 1947. Gandhi passed away in January 1948.

It is not true to say that India accepted Gandhi and his philosophy as a whole. Nor did the Congress organisation accept his philosophy of life. The Congress accepted his constructive program as a tool for mass contact for political purposes. It is well known that he wanted the Congress to convert itself into a Lok Sabha Sangh after independence. He laid down that the members of that Sangh should pledge themselves to work for the socio-economic changes he envisaged without directly entering the field of power politics. He dreamed that the Sangh should and would be so powerful as to influence politics without its members actually entering the field themselves.

All religious and spiritually-oriented leaders and sages from the beginning of history have dreamed like that and they have failed. It is no wonder if Gandhi too had failed in that respect. The politics of the struggle for freedom is always different from the power politics of a free country. While a struggle for freedom demands suffering, sacrifice and selflessness, power politics is oriented to an almost unscrupulous struggle to get power over men and things and retain it. The inordinate will to power and the love of power without the balancing will to serve others and humanity is the cause of today's individual, national, and world politics.

The earlier movements in slave India had prepared the ground for Gandhi. His greatest contribution is the philosophy of *satyagraha* (*satya* through nonviolence alone) and the technique of using it for solving problems in all human activities and affairs. It worked well during his life-time and deteriorated after his death in the hands of those who had neither the spiritual attitude nor the non-violent approach, nor even the moral and ethical purity and selflessness that commanded respect. Today most of the *satyagrahas* are pressure tactics or follow the philosophy of strikes. Gandhi was accepted by patriots and politicians in India because they found in him one who could rouse and command the masses as no one else could. No one could dream of being his rival; and those who opposed him soon lost their foothold among the people as well as the leaders.

Gandhi had realised his historical role as a prophet. Towards the close of the struggle for freedom, when a few of us had gathered round him in his camp at Ringway in Delhi, I remember making the remark that most leaders of revolutions not only achieved the revolutions but also led the governments which came in their wake. He looked at me and said somewhat pensively, 'Main khata ho jaunga', I shall be finished! During the drafting of the Indian Constitution by the Constituent Assembly, I once asked him why he was not taking an interest in it. Gandhi said that if they asked him he would consent. We know how helpless he felt against the political tide that accepted partition though he was totally against it. His intuition was correct. He had said that partition would not solve any problems but would create new ones. That has happened and is happening even now.

Now as regards Gandhi's utter opposition to modern civilisation based on science and technology and the multiplication of wants. Emerson wrote that man builds a house to live in, but he becomes a prisoner! He also wrote that man becomes all the stronger for every desire and temptation he conquers. Man is a toolmaker, but every tool makes him its slave, as he has to depend upon it.

There is an old Sanskrit saying: 'yat yat parasamatham dukkham, yat yat atmasamatham dukkham' (every dependence is a source of sorrow and

every self-reliance is a source of joy).

The soul of man depends upon its body-life-mind complex for its manifestation or expression. Liberation from this dependence, and realization that the self-conscious soul is, in essence, independent, is man's highest achievement in life. Similarly today's advanced science and technology are projections of the human psyche itself and have not come from afar or from outside. A total rejection is therefore neither possible nor advisable. Like body-life-mind of the human consciousness, they are a growth which owes its existence to an inner need for expression. What is necessary, however, is for man to remain the master and not to succumb to their overwhelming influence. Who is it that works in the scientific laboratory and the technological institute? It is the human psyche singly or collectively, secretly or openly. The human psyche is alive to the situation and Gandhi is a warning example. Since Buddha and Christ gave the same warning and failed to convince people at that time we need not be pessimistic about Gandhi's warning either. Humanity is yet in its infancy and it would see day master its instruments rather than rejecting them now. Rejecting them would mean rejection of man's own potentialities without trial. Making the instruments, trying them, using them without becoming their slaves is the way of the creator and of the hero. Rejecting them out of fear or apprehension betrays spiritual weakness.

Gandhi was never for total rejection. What he said was that we should invent, accept and use science and technology (which in themselves are amoral and neutral) without exploitation and without losing mastery over them. This alone can lead us to world affirmation. The other attitude leads us to world rejection and stagnation.

Gandhi was a prophet in the same line as Buddha and Christ. The virtues he preached and practiced were those of saints and sages. They require a total and fundamental conversion of the human psyche and can be attained only by a mutation of man's consciousness as envisaged by Sri Aurobindo. Till then the sadness has to go on.

Gandhi, the prophet that he was, played temporarily the part of a statesman, rather than that of a politician. He believed that it was only an independent India which could play an historical role in the world to come. He succeeded in that first part of the dream. As for spiritualizing politics which was his other dream, he could not make much headway with his followers. As for establishing a casteless and classless society in India, we are yet far off.

Gandhi's view about the use of science and technology were quite clear, he would use them only if they were consistent with human values and the spiritual betterment of man—not of a few, but of the whole of humanity.

In this respect man has begun to realize slowly the dangers of

going too far. Man is not a robot, a machine to be manipulated. He is an unfolding consciousness rising from simple animalism to divine heights, where satyam (truth), shivam (goodness) and sundarim (beauty) would reign supreme. Gandhi, therefore, warned us against everything which involved a concentration of power, whether economic, social, political, intellectual or even spiritual. Non-exploitation of man by man and decentralization of power of every kind are really the by-products of the arch of his extremely human philosophy; and they flow from the dictum, attainment of truth through nonviolence (love) alone.

Durga Das

'Towards a Human Civilization' is how I would caption the subject. The reason is that the world has shrunk and it has become impossible to think in terms of nations.

The world has had three philosophies working on parallel lines. (1) simple living and high thinking, (2) high living and high thinking, (3) high living and simple thinking. The first is built on the concept of austerity, the second on affluence, and the third on technology reducing human beings to robots.

It is obvious that all these have to merge as the Ganga, Jamuna and Saraswati have merged at Triveni to make it for Hindus the most sacred spot for a bath or for performing their mortal ceremonies.

Gandhi's *Hand Swear* is based on eternal values. It has been ignored by his disciples and successors, for they were enamoured by the products of western civilization and political science. Vinoba became a Pope confined to his self-created Vaishya. Jayaprakash Narayan acted more like a political mendicant than a crusader. Other Gandhians inwardly felt a conflict between the gandhian and western values which paralysed their thinking and action.

The world has so far lived on the opiate provided by religion. Technology and science have destroyed man's blind faith in religion, but they cannot provide a substitute. It is for men and women to find another 'opiate', something which will stimulate aspiration and egg them on to fulfilment. That can be based only on a proper balance between his physical needs as ordained by modern conditions and his spiritual impulses. It can be done if the Aryans, Mongoloids and Negroes get together and formulate plans to pool the world's resources for economic regeneration, social well-being, and human fulfilment.

It is my belief that the compulsions of life—the need for survival and for security and stability—will find the answers by the end of the century. India has still the gift to provide the stimulus to such a movement—even on a world scale—provided that our power-corrupted leadership is replaced or transformed by gandhian values for the task of the

great crusade

Prabhakar Machwe

Gandhi gave a fourteen-point constructive program. What have we done with it? The so-called Gandhians are the worst culprits as they have reduced it to a ritual.

Khadi is not self-sufficient, raw silk and fancy cottage industry products are foreign exchange earners of a sort. Prohibition is officially scrapped. Basic Education is denounced by its own previously ardent advocates. Harijan uplift has yielded no more egalitarian a society; on the contrary, the daily report of discrimination, molestation and lynching of untouchables is deafening. The cow is no more the centre of the village economy.

The growth of urbanisation and industrialisation in our country has been haphazard. All our priorities have been unfortunately ill-timed. Need we grow tobacco, opium and cash crops, when the basic food grains are not available in sufficient quantity? Do we need a cement factory or a coloured TV in every home first, while millions die of want and have cancer? Should our students waste their valuable time in ragging and rock music, in drugs and discothèques, or should they do voluntary service in the villages? Why should medical practitioners concentrate only in the metropolises? With so many thousands of unemployed engineers, need our food-control and road-communication be so elementary? Is it so necessary to import foreign films and literary literature, when our best publications don't sell? Are so many fancy delegations to foreign lands really necessary, when many of us have not seen our own land?

Nothing short of a voluntary peon corps or a band of selfless workers, who will go from village to village in the spirit of silent, agitational, violent strikes for the dumb, suffering millions, can rescue us. These volunteers should be above all caste, community, creed, province and language prejudices. They should not be tied to any party or political platform.

There should be a total ban for the next five years on speech making, particularly by the professional politicians, all and sundry. We waste so much of our time, energy and money in this activity. Nothing comes of it but frustration and futility. One ounce of honest dedicated work is better than a ton of verbal display.

The most important change has to come in our social behaviour. How many of us inter-dine, inter-marry, encourage inter-caste friendship and harmony? There is no hope for a nation where the southerner hates the southerner and vice versa, where Bengali and Assamese, Marathi and Mysorean, Hindi-wallah and Urdu-wallah hate one another and do

not try to understand the irritations and appreciate the good points in others.

Charity begins at home. We ought to take up the program of cleaning our own premises, tidying up the surroundings and living more actively. Why can't we bring some sunshine to the dull, drab, dark routine? Can we not grow more flowers and fruit, tend some cattle and pigs, make one illiterate literate and so on?

Gandhi emphasized that physical labour ought to be respected and treated on a par with the so-called intellectual labour. Unfortunately, even after independence, the subtle caste system still plagues us. Technocrats and bureaucrats still rule over the dumb masses of workers and peasants. The disparity in their incomes continues to be unbridgeable. That is hardly the way to socialism.

There should be a thorough reform of our system of selection. We do not select the right person for the right job. Corruption has gone deep into our veins and what is happening is a travesty and mockery of justice. Let everyone have a free chance to compete and let each get what he merits according to his ability.

All this sounds pretty Utopian. But a beginning has to be made somewhere. People are losing faith in the so-called successors of Gandhi, because instead of becoming the instruments of a fundamental change in society they are just behaving like other imperial, disinterested spectators, or seated fiddlers to the *risala-quo-rala*. The situation has to change. Otherwise Gandhi's good name will be lost for ever—at the hands of the self-appointed Gandhians themselves!

R. C. Majumdar

Mahatma Gandhi's view about the real nature of modern Indian civilisation as expressed in the booklet *Hind Swaraj*, published as far back as 1908, has been hitherto regarded as quaint and has produced but little effect upon the people for whom it was meant. The object of this symposium is to discuss whether, in view of the rapid deterioration in every sphere of our life which we witness today, the time has not come to give a trial to the remedy suggested by Gandhi and to respond to his call to reject modern civilisation in toto and return to the ways of life followed in India before the arrival of the British.

In order to judge the merit of any view or theory it is necessary, in the first instance, to examine the validity of the broad assumptions on which it is based. In Chapter VI of his booklet Gandhi says: "Those who are intoxicated by modern civilisation are not likely to write against it. Their care will be to find out facts and arguments in support of it and thus they do unconsciously believing it to be true." My first impression after reading *Hind Swaraj* was that Gandhi himself was a

great victim to this mental disease of intoxication in respect of the ancient civilisation of India. He has made a sweeping denunciation of almost everything modern and held out a very picture of almost everything that preceded it, without the least reference to the obvious merits of the former and defects of the latter. The dogmatic, unreasonable and unhistorical attitude has viciated almost all his conclusions and recommendations. I shall illustrate my allegations by a few examples. Gandhi has waxed eloquent over the miserable condition of the industrial workers. The picture drawn by him is highly exaggerated, so far as the present condition is concerned. But be that as it may, one may well ask whether the condition of the slaves in old times was not much worse. Certainly enough, Gandhi pleads, by way of extenuating the old civilisation, that 'formerly men were made slaves under physical compulsion, whereas the industrial workers are enslaved by temptation of money and of the luxuries that money can buy'. No humanitarian would possibly deny that miseries and sufferings imposed on an individual by physical force against his will or choice are a hundred times worse than a voluntary acceptance of the same by temptation. It is also very singular that Gandhi has not a word to say about the social slaves—the untouchables, the chandalas and others—the condition of whom may be regarded as the worst blot upon ancient Indian civilisation from which the modern age is free, at least theoretically and to a very large extent even practically. This is proved by Gandhi's campaign in favour of temple entry by the untouchables. If we think of the rules and regulations of the *Mama-Sanskrit* prescribing the conditions under which the untouchables and the chandalas, etc. had to live from birth to death, and the privileges enjoyed by the brahmins, merely by the accident of birth, as against other classes not so fortunate, we cannot look back upon the good old days without a sense of horror. When I remember that two thousand years had passed before the laws were remodelled in modern India, making everyone equal in the eyes of law, I for one would not like to go back to the ancient society, however blessed life might otherwise have been. I am sure women, who form half the population of India, would think three times before they would go back to the old days of the *Mama-Sanskrit* which lays down categorically that women at every stage in life, from birth to death, must remain subservient to a male and should never dream of leading an independent life. Gandhi has not a word to say of these evils of ancient Indian culture which he recommends to modern Indians, though he constantly harps on the good old days when men and women of all castes and classes were happy beyond imagination.

An extreme but typical example of the quaint ideas of Gandhi, which I am sure 99 per cent of the Indians would expect straightaway without a moment's thought, is furnished by his strong denunciation of lawyers, doctors and railways. These, we are told in Chapter IX, 'have

impoverished the country, so much so, that if we do not wake up in time we shall be ruined' He says that his 'firm opinion is that the lawyers have enslaved India' It would be no much to the understanding to ask to prove that the lawyers played a very important, if not the most important, role in Indian politics in the 19th century which paved the way for the successful struggle for freedom against the British But Gandhi has not a word to say about it in the course of his sweeping denunciation of the whole class of lawyers.

As regards the doctor Gandhi does not refer to the marvellous progress in surgery, unknown in ancient days, and the fact that the remedy for most of the intractable diseases like phthis, typhoid, small pox, cholera, kala-azar, malaria, etc. has been discovered in modern days One would like to know how many Indians would entrust their cures to the practitioners of the Ayurveda and Unani systems if they could afford to call a modern doctor or send the patients to a hospital, which Gandhi describes as an 'institution for propagating sin' According to Gandhi, 'it is beyond dispute that the railways propagate evil', and 'English education has enslaved us' He ignores the fact that the railways and English education are the most important factors in bringing together the most diverse peoples of this vast sub-continent and creating the spirit of nationalism unknown before It is hardly necessary to discuss his *Ignorance* that 'we were one nation before the British came to India Subsequently they divided us' His reference to the Muslim attitude towards the Hindus (Chapter X) violates every known fact of history.

The above views and statements, to which many others may be easily added, are so quaint and palpably absurd that any conclusion based on them cannot be taken seriously But even apart from this, there is one vital objection to the proposal that the remedy for the misery from which the country has been suffering is to reject modern civilisation and go back to the old way In view of the evils of the old way and the remarkable progress of modern civilisation in many ways, as pointed out above, it may be regarded as absolutely certain that with the probable exception of one per cent of the Indian population at the utmost, who have implicit faith in Gandhi, none can be induced by either threat or temptation to choose the old way of life and forsake the modern civilisation which he now enjoys

The Editors are certainly right in their estimate of the extent of the present evils, and the urgent need of a remedy But since the very basis of the remedy suggested by them is theoretically wrong and obviously impracticable, we must think of other means to ease the evils In my opinion the evils are due, mainly if not solely, not so much to the defects in the present system of administration or the type of civilisation under which we live, as to the demoralisation of the men entrusted with

its proper working. The achievement of the independence of India was heralded by a program of nationalization as the basis of administration. How far it has succeeded in improving the economic condition of the country, for which it was primarily intent, is a matter of serious doubt and keen dispute, but there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that its chief result has been a complete all-round success only in the nationalization of manhood (including corruption), inefficiency and undisciplined, not only in all branches and departments of the Government, but in all institutions and among all classes and ranks of Indians today. The efforts of those who want to save the country from the depths of misery and degradation and impending ruin should be directed to the eradication of this evil. We should carry on a vigorous propaganda and campaign for the purity of life and high moral and spiritual ideals of which Gandhi was a shining example, rather than transplanting the out-moded ideas and sentiments which he had recorded in *My Experiments with Truth*. It is my firm belief that if at least fifty per cent of the Ministers and twenty-five per cent of the high officials are efficient, free from corruption, and inspired solely by the sense of duty and not self-aggrandizement, and similar changes similar reforms are effected in private institutions, India under the modern civilization would find its way to economic prosperity and moral and intellectual progress, and the necessary changes and adjustments between our ancient ideals and modern practices would automatically follow.

It may be argued that to bring about such a transformation is difficult, if not impossible! But certainly it is less difficult and far more practicable than the scheme of taking back the Indian society to the culture and civilization that flourished more than two thousand years ago, after discarding the modern civilization which has steadily developed during the last two hundred years.

So while I think that every right-thinking man should agree to the assessment of the present evils in India and appreciate the serious nature and the gravity of the problem posed by the Editors, I am unable to accept the remedy suggested by Gandhi in *My Experiments with Truth* and hence offer a counter-proposal. I merely suggest the outline for there is no use discussing details until the general approach is approved.

D.R. Mahabhar

This is a moment when our country is going through an intense moral crisis—a crisis of character and credibility. It stems from a jettisoning of the spiritual values so essential even for a materialistic modern state to survive and progress. This is indeed the sickness of the spirit we as a nation are suffering from. It is natural and right, therefore, that the nation should, on the rebound, turn for solace and refuge to the Father

of the Nation, whom it had deserted all these years.

Nevertheless, an equally relevant question to ask is—could a people and a leadership, found so woefully wanting in fulfilling the relatively modest goals of a conventional modern state, with all its panoply of the coercive governmental apparatus to back its writ, measure up to the rigorous requirements of a *Rajraj*—the nonviolent, cooperative, decentralised, democratic state of Gandhi's dreams? Such a state is to be based on the lofty concept of trusteeship, love and voluntary service where force is banished—'a moral society where humanist values would be fulfilled under God's rule'. Is this day good enough to sculpt such a noble and magnificent structure?

Nor would it be practicable or wise to turn our backs on the modern scientific age. Without large-scale industrialization, can we really solve our colossal unemployment problem in a country where the population grows at the rate of 13 millions every year, granting that village industries are fully developed?

And how do we effectively attack the crying twin needs of agrarian reform and maximized food production, without modernizing agriculture and all that goes with it? Lifting above due want the forty per cent of the people now living below the subsistence level has to be the highest priority task before any Indian government.

After 1962 and the Indian debacle against China, and with a constant threat to the country's security from close and distant neighbours, it would be next to impossible to sell our people the idea of a state sans armed force and based on the Sermon-on-the-Mount principles.

Can we then arbitrarily pick and choose, like selecting weapons from an armoury, certain aspects of the gandhian socio-economic philosophy and reject others? I think this is both possible and advisable.

We refused to rely on nonviolence to defend our hard-won independence in this predatory world. Nor were we prepared to accept the gandhian theory of trusteeship in industrial relations. Nehru himself could not trust unchecked power and wealth to an individual and expect him to use them earnestly for the public good. 'Even Plato's philosopher-kings would hardly have borne this burden worthily', he commented. Independent India, however, professed to continue to adhere to the gandhian moral values.

Nevertheless, at the root of the sickness of the spirit is to be found the abandonment, on the part of our leadership, of their precious heritage and sheet-anchor of the gandhian ethic and values, in crass pursuit of cynical, opportunistic politics, where the propitiation of the bitch-goddess called Vote-Mafia became a public man's supreme political preoccupation. Thus the very fount of the country's politics is poisoned.

It is a travesty of democracy where politicians have to sacrifice principles for the sake of the vote and labour leaders vie with one another to

get for the workers more and more wages for less and less work, when they know that higher productivity is the only way for the country's economic malaise and that higher wages are illusory in the absence of greater production.

This cavalier attitude to the country's affairs on the part of the leaders is responsible for the prevailing shocking political dishonesty, double-speak, double standards and corruption of the soul that is today eating into the very vitals of the Indian polity. These are all symptoms of the sickness of the spirit the nation is suffering from.

If the grave damage done to the Indian polity is to be repaired, going back to the godman ethic and values in public and private life seems imperative. But such a transformation of Indian society is impossible without a wholesale change in the leadership and the introduction of an entirely new vintage.

Indeed, the quality of the leadership can make a world of difference to the character and strength of a nation. People are just so much putty in the hands of the leadership. Good leadership, like a good sculptor, can turn the wonderful plastic material into a beautiful and durable shape, even as a poor sculptor, like poor leadership, can make a complete mess of the clay in his hands.

We have before us the remarkable example of what good, effective leadership can do with human material. China, for long dubbed 'decadent' and 'a nation of coolies', under Mao's leadership almost overnight turned into a highly disciplined, proud, hard-working people, taking their place among the major nations of the world.

The credit for this miracle entirely goes to the Mao leadership's skill as well as single-minded dedication to the good of the people, the code-belay it expects in the eyes of its people; and above all, its readiness to enforce the rule of law and surely to put down anti-social elements whenever found, irrespective of personalities.

Guy Wint in his book, *Spectacle on China*, recalls the conditions in pre-1949 China in these words: 'It was not only poverty which made China decadent and explosive. It was the universal inhumanity and brutality...there was the horror of a decaying society, without firm government, in which jungle conditions prevailed, and the strong man, whether landlord, village boss, government or party official, army officer or bandit, preyed on the weak. The scale of corruption had increased in a monstrous way, and reform was very much needed.' If the present trends continue, that description of Chiang's China might soon apply to India.

I am convinced that a good leadership in our country could have easily moulded the Indian people into a great nation by eliminating their civic weaknesses, quickening their sense of public duty and social conscience and fostering social discipline in them — the three essential qual-

listeners for the citizenship of a modern state. In the last 26 years, all these three qualities have, far from growing, eroded among the Indian people. For that the blame has to be squarely laid at the door of the present leadership—I use the term in a broader sense, not confining it to any particular party but applying it to the entire genre of the prevailing Indian leadership.

In place of the current of the communist ideology, we have had the equally powerful legacy of the gandhian philosophy and ethic which would have served as a powerful bond to bind us into a disciplined nation, if only the leadership had not discarded it so thoughtlessly.

Therefore, anyone who undertakes the mission of curing the sickness of the spirit in this country must start with a radical change in the leadership of the country.

In 1928, Franklin Roosevelt fought and won the Presidential election in the USA on a solemn promise to clean up the Augean stables of the country's politics. And he sent a call to all good men and true. A band of intellectuals from the universities and the professions answered his call and rallied to him in the holy crusade.

In India a Jayaprakash Narayan or a Vinoba Bhave should lead a similar movement, and there are thousands in the country, old and young, particularly among the young, eagerly waiting to answer such an inspiring call from such a man, on a single promise of clean politics and an honest deal for the common man.

People will vote for them and voluntarily work for their victory. Such is the intensity of the people's hunger for a just and clean administration, honest leaders and a return to the rule of law. For they know that everything else will follow. Such a leadership alone can generate an entirely new atmosphere of right conduct and gandhian values. Then there is a chance of the sarvodaya ideals succeeding, at any rate, in village India.

R. K. Puri

There could be hardly two opinions about the progressively worsening malaise which has gripped India. High prices of essential articles, quite beyond the means of the majority, progressively rising unemployment, both rural and urban, striking corruption in all walks of social, economic and political life, and unattended urbanisation with its concomitant problems of slums, inadequate water supply, alienation and a tendency to violence, are its main indications. But are these so unexpected? In dealing with them, why try to hide behind philosophical expressions like 'the sickness of the spirit' or call for "desperate appliances" which question the very philosophy behind India's development effort?

If the remedy is to root the disease let us be quite clear about the

origin. India has adopted the path of modern industrialization for its all-around development—and not that of *Mind Swayay*. It is doubtful, therefore, if even Gandhi, had he been living today, would have advocated it. As he stated himself: "I would warn the reader against thinking that I am today among at the vanguard described therein. I know that India is not for it. . . . But today my corporate activity is undoubtedly devoted to the attainment of parliamentary sway in accordance with the wishes of the people of India." So he wrote in 1921. He reaffirmed it in 1938 and would probably have said the same thing today. Even in his last will and testament, he wanted constructive workers to educate the voters through social service and other selfless activities. He clearly wanted India's development through parliamentary sway, i.e. decentralized democracy.

Every country following that path has, during its progress, come across these very problems. They met them face to face and overcame them by suitable action, involving no change in the set course. The remedies for our present ills must therefore be sought in similar action, for we are following the same path. It is very easy, in one sense, to suggest a change and ask for a return to "the vision of Gandhi"—call it by any other undeniably less popular expression, if you like. But to adopt it in the concrete would require another Gandhi, another leadership and perhaps another people. Even during his own lifetime, the Indian leadership and people rejected Gandhi's advice at least twice: once in 1941, when the Congress Working Committee offered cooperation in the war effort if responsible government was conceded, and again in 1947, when the division of the country was accepted. The same result would await him, were he to suggest it today.

For good or evil, India has decided to sink or swim with the rest of the world and to accept the current world picture about future progress and development through industrialization. Let us be clear that this picture is the same, whatever be the ideology adopted for development. In this respect there is no difference between the East and the West—democracy or totalitarianism. The world either refuses to be aware that the present industrial civilization is inexorably leading it to the brink of a doomed precipice, with its evils of pollution, exhaustion of natural resources, and moral and spiritual bankruptcy, or it foolishly believes that these could be tackled somehow. Anyway the attitude seems to be: "If we have to perish, let us all perish together."

The present ills are all familiar obstacles on the road and have to be tackled by purposeful action, high prices by their reduction or even, if necessary, by a reform of currency, rising unemployment by the creation of more jobs, sinking corruption, by laying down better standards of character all over, and unplanned urbanization by the better development of rural life and a regulated development of urban areas. All this

can be achieved, with higher standards of administration, character, economic planning and a stronger will. And the nation must adopt these remedies rather than try to seek refuge by suggesting a different course on an uncharted sea.

But let us not commit the mistake of assuming that Gandhi has no relevance today. He has relevance to the extent and manner in which his ideas can be applied to our current problems. Practising of voluntary poverty is one such idea. His constructive program has to be re-examined from this angle. The fight against caste and untouchability, the national language program, work amongst women, communal unity, Adivasi, leprosy work, and other items are all as relevant today as of old. But khadi, village industries, basic education, self-sufficiency and contraception must be reinterpreted in the modern context of the need for full employment and a better living standard.

But it was quite unnecessary for the nation to load itself with the burden of a colonial foreign debt and go about the world with a begging bowl, for money and grain. This could have been avoided without a change of course. Look at China. It has achieved a place in the company of nations through self-reliance, austerity and purposeful will and action. Let us not dismiss these achievements by ascribing them to confucian methods. Given the will and the leadership, they are all possible even in our democratic setting and context. The Bhoodan movement was a humble effort in this direction. But there is no limit to human effort and the capacity for improvement, and even to human suffering and the achievement of death, honesty and truthfully thought out and pushed through with will and determination.

Let us base ourselves on the terra firma of thought and action which we can comprehend as cause and effect. Certainly let us have as much of Gandhi's austerity, austerity, purity, strength of will and character as we can master. But today's need is to design and enforce the practical implications of these virtues in all walks of national life, including elections, education, administration, trade practices, social systems, political institutions and other related items. As a nation we have to introspect and question ourselves deeply and staunchly about the causes of the present malaise, and evolve remedies dictated by our reason and perception, but against the background of the ideas and ideals which Gandhi stood for and which he demonstrated in his active and purposeful life all these years.

K. Rangachari

For nearly a decade now, the Indian people have been passing through one crisis after another. The cumulative effect has been a loss of national morale and lack of confidence in their future. Today this pessimism

seems to have reached a new low. One can observe a deep, and often bitter, cynicism among those who have an awareness of social and political trends and can measure our performance against recognized standards of achievement. There is deep disillusionment among the poor and the illiterate who have been encouraged to cherish high expectations about their well-being in an independent India. Why should a people who had maintained a robust optimism during the vicissitudes of the freedom struggle feel differently now? The goals were then clear and the means to achieve them were not in doubt; the dedication of the leadership to the great cause was above question. The situation is in reverse today. There is confusion and perversion of means and ends, amidst the din of populist demagoguery the ordinary citizen is no longer clear about the purpose and direction of our national effort. He feels duped by the insouciant confidence which is practised on him by politicians at election time.

The disease is so well known that it requires no elaboration at length. There is a crisis of confidence which is eroding a still patient people's faith in the values of liberty and democracy, for the preservation of which no sacrifice seemed too great during the movement for freedom. Except the diehard traditionalists, no one can be happy about the present mood in the country. A rapidly increasing population, without a corresponding increase in the opportunities for work and the means of subsistence, co-exists with private opulence and ostentatious living; there has been a steady deterioration of all moral values and standards of public life and conduct. Why, how and when did the nation's chosen path go wrong? The responsibility of individual leaders who have been custodians of the national interest is perhaps very large. However, a more charitable view, which would exonerate individuals, would attribute the failure to the nation's deviation from the path illuminated by Gandhi, though we continue to pay hypocritical homage to him as the Father of the Nation. There has been a blind imitation of the ways of the advanced industrial countries for finding the means of economic salvation for the masses, without acquiring comparable efficiency in applying their methods or in overcoming difficulties. Gandhi knew his people and their limitations, he had the insight to foresee the inadequacy of the resources of the country to provide anything more than a simple way of living for all the inhabitants, on the assumption that the resources were equitably distributed. He therefore warned us not to set our sights so high in terms of the enjoyment of material goods—and a living style based on possessing a lot of them—as to rankle the inevitable disappointment. By history and tradition, India, he felt, was qualified to play a distinctive role in the world. But few prophets are honoured in their own country and Gandhi's warning has gone unheeded during the quarter of a century of swayag. Not the good life for all but the acquisition

of power by the few over the many—by politicians, business men, civil servants, trade unions, big landlords and top professionals—has become the objective of social and economic policies. The pursuit of wealth by any means, however unscrupulous, in order to achieve such power is coming to be recognized by the so-called elite as necessary and reasonable.

Can the nation now reverse its steps and go back to the path shown by Gandhi of accepting a life of voluntary poverty? Life for the masses who are already living in poverty would not involve any special hardship but, on the other hand, may bring benefits in terms of better conditions of living brought about by a better social order. The real difficulty would arise from the 'vested interests' in the existing social system. A Gandhian has to ensure that this resistance can be overcome by moral persuasion and a change of heart induced by nonviolent satyagraha, if that should become necessary. Also there is no reason yet to abandon the hope that the democratic processes of the country will in the long run, if not in the short, help the emergence of a leadership which is less self-centred and sufficiently enlightened to recognize the need for giving a new direction to the national effort. However, a change either way cannot come about by mere wishful thinking. The Gandhians of India must urge and propagate the idea of simplicity (if not of asceticity) and the banishment of the cumbersome and often superfluous gadgets of modern civilization. There are, however, limits to what an open and free society can do; it will be un-Gandhian to force people to adopt a different way of life by the use of state power. But if the resources which the state can command, and those which can be induced, by policy methods, to serve its purposes, are devoted mainly to the provision of material goods for the physical and mental well being of the majority of the people in the villages which have been consistently neglected, and the leadership sets an example of simple living, the revolution will not be too difficult to make.

The revolution against the ugly aspects of modern industrialism has already manifested itself in the West while those who pay lip service to Gandhi still wallow in its illusory phantoms. The rapid and alarming degradation of the earth's resources, environmental pollution which threatens the safety and survival of human and animal life, the glaring inequalities among men and nations and the temptation for the rich and poor countries alike to spend vast sums of money on armaments (now amounting to nearly \$200 billion a year and increasing at an annual rate of 6 per cent) have all reached disturbing proportions. The more sensitive among the youth of the industrial countries have rebelled against the dehumanizing trends of modern industrial growth and registered their protest against wars and racial intolerance. Should the people of India re-exact the same western experience and tolerate the obnoxious aspects

of modern industrialism before rediscovering the message of Gandhi?

The root of the trouble in India is the highly centralized system of planning which is based on questionable premises. Despite the more recent verbal declarations about social justice and the achievement of minimum standards of living, plans are based on a continuing diversion of resources to gigantic projects in heavy industries and modern communications (like telephones, aviation and TV) while the needs of food and shelter of the growing population, and programs designed to remove illiteracy and disease and make life a little more decent in the villages, remain neglected. A beginning in the reform of our objectives and methods with a view to uplifting the downtrodden and the poor should be made at this planning stage. Perhaps the change may not come until the people, in whose name many crimes are now being committed, register their massive protest instead of handing out massive mandates for their own impoverishment.

This does not, however, answer the question whether the people will embrace voluntary poverty in the sense that Gandhi intended. In a philosophical sense perhaps, an ordinary person cannot really surrender a thing which he does not possess or does not hope to possess. Any self-denial has only be a kind of self-grasping in such circumstances. It is, therefore, inadvisable to take an extreme view of Gandhi's doctrine of voluntary poverty and interpret it literally. Not all the evils of the present day are the results of industrialism and human nature had exhibited its baser side even in the pre-technological age. There was nothing pretty about the squalid poverty, social inequality and vulnerability to disease of human beings in the earlier centuries. While deprecating the excesses committed in the name of technological advance, we cannot afford to ignore the positive side of modern communications which bring people together and make men realize the universality of basic human values.

There can, therefore, be no outright rejection of the progress in human civilization. Its content and character must be redefined from time to time and place to place. The capacity to invent and innovate is inherent in human nature, whether it is a blessing or a curse will depend on the ultimate use of this capacity. The pursuit of wealth is the pursuit of the instruments of human welfare, if the instrumentary complicate life without ennobling the mind, and the nation's resources are funnelled into an endlessly spending consumer economy which presupposes a distribution of income, then clearly the direction is wrong. As Emerson said, things are in the saddle and ride mankind. The means crowd out the ends and the so-called civilization reverts to barbarism on a different plane.

While Gandhi enunciated some of his doctrines in an extreme form, he was not given to dogmatism. He had the acumen to compromise

and comes to terms with realism. We can only guess how he would have reformulated his doctrine of voluntary poverty to make it a workable program in the current context. He once said: 'I do varanasi electricity, shipbuilding, iron works, machine making and the like existing side by side with village crafts. But the order of dependence will be reversed. Hitherto industrialization has been so planned as to destroy the village and village crafts. . . . Under my scheme, nothing will allowed to be produced by cities which can equally well be produced in the villages. The proper function of cities is to serve as a clearing house for village products.' There is no reason why we should not subscribe to this basic proposition.

Our politicians and policymakers have only talked about decentralized planning and some feeble beginnings have been made. But centralized planning still dominates the scene and a handful of planners sitting in Delhi decide the details of what should be done at the regional or district level. There are no credible schemes for utilizing the vast rural manpower in schemes to improve living conditions and provide community services, or for motivating the rural people to rely on their own concerted efforts for the many things for which they are now expected to look up to an unsympathetic and increasingly corrupt officialdom. The take-over by the state of many aspects of private activity, ostensibly in the name of socialism but in reality to extend the area of its patronage for political purposes, compels the citizens to look up to the state for everything. 'Swaraj will be a sorry affair,' said Gandhi, 'if people look up to it [the state] for the regulation of every detail of life.' Big government, big business, big trade unionism have all dwarfed the individual and destroyed his initiative. his role is confined to paying out the big money they want for their purposes in taxes, prices and other levies. Those who believe that Gandhi's message has relevance to our present condition (their numbers may be larger than we think) have to undertake a sustained campaign to educate the people about the moral decadence we have suffered and the alternatives that are still open to us to regain national self-respect and self-reliance in the true sense. A non-violent satyagraha may be necessary as the next step, elections based on adult suffrage should normally have rendered such a course unnecessary, but the shameful manner in which they are rigged and the people misled by money and propaganda has vitiated the democratic process. Satyagraha cannot, however, succeed unless the people are made aware of its objectives.

P. Kodanda Rao

The main purpose of *Hind Swaraj* was the demand of home rule for India. It was therefore primarily political in aim. Gandhi regretted

that British rule had introduced the western and modern civilization into India to the detriment of her own ancient civilization which he claimed was superior. He therefore advocated the rejection of the western and modern civilization and the restoration of the ancient Indian civilization.

The working theme of the Symposium does not define precisely enough what constitutes the western and modern civilization and what constitutes the ancient Indian civilization. It recommends the practice of voluntary poverty, but does not define what poverty means. To enable a more purposeful discussion, these phrases should be defined as precisely as possible, otherwise the discussion will turn on vague generalities.

Truth and nonviolence are among the principles advocated by Gandhi, but they are as old as humanity itself. Even today in the law courts witnesses are under oath to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. In fact, telling lies has been a crime! In practice, most people tell the truth most of the time, some depart from it practically all the time, and many do so on exceptional occasions when it is to their profit. The difference is between profession of truth and practice of it. Gandhi did not invent the ethical imperative, nor succeed in securing its universal practice. Everybody preaches it, but few are Hirschfelders at any time in human history.

Nonviolence or ahimsa is also as old as humanity and pretty universal. Everybody is not at everybody's throat every day. Violence is a crime and is exceptional. Even as an ideal, Gandhi was not the creator of nonviolence. All religions and prophets have preached it. Gandhi also preached it and he practised it in his life perhaps more effectively than most others. But on occasions he evoked courage above ahimsa! He subordinated ahimsa to compassion when he approved of mercy-killing of animals suffering from incurable diseases, he subordinated ahimsa to patriotism when he recruited soldiers for the army during World War I. While he proposed to meet the Japanese invasion nonviolently, he approved of the Indian troops using force in Kashmir to repel the raiders in 1947. He even approved of euthanasia for human beings.

Gandhi believed in God, but his definition of God was not consistent. On some occasions he said that God was Truth and on others that Truth was God and on yet other occasions that God was Love. He explained his definition of Truth as God in order to accommodate an atheist like Charles Bradlaugh whom he admired as a good man!

In my opinion, the special contributions of Gandhi were not truth and nonviolence but ahimsa for the sake of others, as when he undertook a fast to bring about Hindu-Muslim unity or when he felt that all his instruments in his anti-untouchability campaign were not pure. But

some of his fasts were coercive measures as they were intended to compel others to do what they did not wish to do voluntarily and cheerfully; as, for instance, when he failed to coerce the Government of India, against its will, to hand over Rs. 50 crore to Pakistan. Gandhi did not, however, undertake a fast to coerce the British Government to yield sway to India or prevent the partition of India, though he had said that India could be partitioned only over his dead body. He did not undertake a fast against Jinnah to persuade or coerce him to give up his demand for the partition of India.

The concrete proposals contained in *Myed Swamy* were pronounced to be impracticable by several eminent authorities like Professor Seddy. Gandhi himself had said that India was not ripe for the kind of sway which he projected. That I fear is still the case. There is however one proposal of his which I venture to dissent from. He postulated that English was the language of the foreign British rulers and should therefore be eschewed by India under sway, and that she should adopt Hindi as the national language. I submit that no language is, or can be, either 'foreign' or 'Indian' since it can have no political nationality, British, Indian or other. No language has either a nationality or a race or a religion or a sex. Language is a universal inheritance. A professor who shares his knowledge of language with his pupils will not share his salary also with them. This is because language is a non-national cultural element which cannot be owned by anybody but which can be acquired by everybody, whereas salary or property is a material cultural element and can be owned by individuals or groups of individuals. This distinction between the material and non-material cultural elements is, in my humble opinion, of vital importance. If English were of British nationality or belonged to the British, then Gandhi would not have been able to use it nor Gandhi *Myed*.

In some quarters there is prejudice against English in the belief that it was imposed by the British rulers for their own convenience on Indians. But the fact is that no less a statesman and patriot than Raja Ram Mohan Ray invited the introduction of English into India to give Indians access to modern experimental science, and his plea was given official sanction by Lord William Bentinck, the Governor General and Lord Macaulay, his Law Minister. It was again the Raja who advocated that the official language of the Government of India should be English in the place of Persian.

Rajaw was Gandhi's apostle in several respects, including Hindi. When he was the Chief Minister of Madras he introduced Hindi in the educational system and made it compulsory, but by 1867 he changed and proclaimed that English should be the medium of higher education and higher administration throughout India and on a permanent basis. At the Convention on the place of English in the Indian educational

system, held in Madras in November 1967, Raju said: "My friend, Kottanda Rao, was the first to use that we should definitely and without any doubt say that we want English for ever. I thought that he was using too strong a phrase which would attract poison on the other side. On the face of a "for ever" looked quoted, so I hesitated to accept that slogan. Kottanda Rao persisted in spite of considerable feeling that he was going too strong. But he kept up without relaxing. Now we have come to his position."

Gandhi is a prophet to be worshipped like the Buddha, but most of his concrete policies do not seem to have universal relevance, or special relevance to India at any time.

Mohd Sen

Who can deny that a sickening moral crisis pervades the upper and middle echelons of Indian society! Indeed, one of the more disgusting characteristics of this moral crisis is the enormous amount of broadcasting and the cries of *own culpa* that reverberate from these very echelons. They seem to forget that far from being the doctors they are themselves the disease.

A great deal of the weeping about the moral crisis in India is nothing but a smokescreen to hide the material causes and basis of this crisis. When millions starve but monopolists hoard foodgrains, we are confronted certainly with a moral crisis, but one that emanates from deeply material-social causes. And the remedy is not the preaching of morals to the hoarders and monopolists but drastic social surgery—the removal of those breeding grounds of a thoroughly immoral situation.

Many things have happened in India in the twenty-five years of our freedom about which we can be legitimately proud. There have been economic achievements which make our country better able to stand up to whatever winds may blow from the storm centres of imperialist intervention. Our people today have a better recognition of the international linkages of our struggle to complete our process of becoming Friendship with the Soviet Union is stronger today than ever before. We have not done enough by far but we have done something to aid the struggle of other peoples to be free. Hence we have an Bangla Desh as a neighbour and we have the friendship of the immortal and valiant people of Vietnam.

Where we have failed and failed quite abjectly is to complete the promise of our struggle for freedom. The accepted program of the national movement remains largely unimplemented. The radical prescriptions of a Gandhi or a Nehru serve as reminders, as beacons and not as directions of accomplishment. Many wars remain to be waged from many millions of eyes and *Dardra Narayani* still starts out from the

random eyes of the Indian bird under the Indian sky.

At the same time, we have the reverse side of the medal. Some have gained from this failure, more particularly the gentry who claimed to live in the shadow of Gandhi. The landlords have not obliged by running away but have continued to murder and to burn those who were given the name of the children of God.

What has, however, happened as a result of the 25 years of contradictory development is that a stage has been reached when the equilibrium of the middle way, based on the mixed economy, the system of dreds and patches, has begun to give way. Equilibrium, even a moving one, is replaced by almost instantaneous oscillation. The masses are no longer willing to put up with a plastic plan economy not reconcile themselves to a situation where a lot is within sight but out of reach, as Mrs Indira Gandhi put it. More particularly, one would like to add, when what is in sight is grabbed by a few within the vision of the many.

What is one to say of a situation where the national income rises by less than one per cent, prices rise by over 20 per cent and registered unemployment jumps by 24 per cent—all in a single year and a year after the tremendous thrill of helping the liberation of 75 million people? What is one to say when the Finance Minister himself admits the existence of a parallel economy run on a black money stock of Rs 1,500 crore with an annual increment of Rs 1,400 crore? And to make one more agast, the same Finance Minister refuses to take a single worthwhile remedial measure!

And where the monopolists and landlords set the pace, it is only natural that vast segments of what are called the middle-classes follow. This is the true process of sandalization as a prelude to vulgarization that shapes so much of social life in our country.

The remedy lies not in the preaching of morals but the proclamation of a program of struggle against an order that can no longer be mended but has to be ended. One can even go further and state that the program is there—indeed, it has been there since the thirties—but the call to struggle does not sound clearly and firmly enough. Let us remember that the greatest moral regeneration of modern India was accomplished when the call for courage and for sacrifice came from a man who became the greatest organizer of the anti-imperialist struggle of our millions. The pointing to the need for purification evoked response since it was inextricably linked with concrete programs for concrete struggles. And shall we forget that it was this very man of morals who urged his closest henchmen to launch another satyagraha in 1947? The man of morals also called himself the generalissimo of mass action. This was the way to cut the Gordian knot then. This is the way today.

Radhakrishnan

In much the same way as most people, even those professedly atheist, when in a real fix invoke God (I remember Dr. Radhakrishnan telling us that when he had asked a Soviet communist what she had done when first shot into space she had replied that she had prayed) we Indians call on Gandhi when things go desperately wrong with us. No one will dispute that the present state of affairs in our country, in both economic and moral terms, has reached one of its lowest points in our national history. I do not mean by this, history stretching back to the days of the Pandavas and the Thugs, but contemporary history. In matters such as these one must exercise some sense of proportion and restraint. Things are certainly bad in India at the moment, but to say that everything is down and out or has collapsed is, to use the Churchillian phrase, a terminological inexactitude, or, to be less parliamentary, *bliss*.

I cannot claim to be an expert in gandhian thought. But I do belong to the generation which grew up under the mantle of his teachings and was influenced by them. Personally also, I had more than the usual opportunity of meeting and talking to him, and even more of knowing people who were his intimates, and have tried to analyse him and follow his principles. That can be the only justification for my venturing to participate in this symposium, which sets out to examine the prevailing sickness of spirit that has afflicted our country, in the light of gandhian precepts and practices.

It has been said that Gandhi prescribed 'voluntary' renunciation as a method for meeting the challenge of modern technology and the material affluence that follows in its wake. His precepts and practices, it is said, have been rejected out of hand by his successors (presumably the principal person responsible for that being Jawaharlal Nehru), and that as a result, the nation is now being compelled to accept renunciation, a fate a hundred times worse than the former.

I am afraid that I cannot accept the theme. It is off the mark. In my opinion, it gives a wrong impression of Gandhi's whole philosophy. The basic thrust in that philosophy, it seems to me, lies in its advocacy of the ideal of self-sufficiency-self-sufficiency in spirit. Such self-sufficiency can only be attained in this world by a fully satisfied person: one who has no further desires to satisfy here below. In brief, one who has succeeded in divesting himself of all worldly desires. It should not however be overlooked that his urge to divest himself of worldly desires is itself a 'desire'. It may be a substitution of a lower desire by a higher one. None the less it is a desire and must be recognized as such. It is not so much a 'voluntary' renunciation as a sublimation. It can only come to a person who has created within himself the capacity to

establish communion with something outside or rather above this world; with the all-pervading creative spirit, whom some call God and others by other names. Such persons are rare. To the ordinary man they appear to belong to a different category of human beings. They are not of this world; they are saints.

Gandhi was too shrewd and down-to-earth a man as well as a saint-in that he has his uniqueness-with too close a finger on the pulse of ordinary human beings to be under any illusion that human beings as a whole are made of anything except flesh and blood with base acquisitive instincts. The latter indeed constitute the motive power of the whole human progressive process and will for survival. In fact, without 'acquisition' there can be no 'voluntary' or any other kind of renunciation.

Therefore, what Gandhi meant by 'voluntary' renunciation was not a complete turning of the face to the progress of technology and man's mastery over matter. He wanted man to use technology and material progress for its true purpose, namely, to enable man to live in this world in a manner that would help him to feel at peace with himself and his desires, both worldly and spiritual, and with other living beings and the environment. For this purpose there has to be a harmony between means and ends.

Looking on the Indian scene, he realised perhaps better than any of our subsequent political leaders, that the Indian masses could only secure a better life and find their true position in society if they were provided with the means to improve their own economic position. It could not be done by imposing on them a system of production of which they were not the masters, but only the slaves. Therefore, he was against the importation of foreign techniques of industrialisation and manufacture which turn the worker into nothing more than a slave, even if he is a well-fed one. On the other hand, he was anxious to provide the common man with the best possible tools to enable him to work with the maximum efficiency and thereby improve his material lot. The classic example of this was his attitude towards the charkha. Gandhi was anxious that the peasant should produce his own cloth with his own hands. This was not so much because he was against modern machinery, but because he knew that a peasant working modern machinery installed in a factory in the city would be totally deprived of that freedom and independence that he considered the most precious gift, indeed the indispensable quality that a free society should confer on its citizens. He was therefore against the establishment of giant modern industrial complexes in India. At the same time, he was extremely anxious that villagers should be provided with the best possible means for spinning yarn in their own villages during their spare time. Hence his interest in developing the most efficient type of charkha within the purchasing

power of the villagers. He wanted village production to rise, leading gradually to the establishment of small-scale village industries.

The fundamental mistake in Indian planning has been the imposition from above of imported techniques and industrial complexes on a basically rural society that is still largely illiterate. At best, the latter can only mimic the motions of operating them without in the least understanding their modes of operation, let alone mastering it. The machine is like a god that has to be propitiated, or rather like a demon that has to be appeased by human sacrifice. Such progress in industrialization has no real relevance to the development of the personality of the common man. It only enslaves him.

What Gandhi would have approved of however, even in such industrialization, would have been—if the Hindustan Machine Tools factory, for instance, had been set up to produce on a mass scale—not ultra-sophisticated machine tools that we can only see in Europe and America, or for setting up other similar industrial complexes in India, where again the workmen are reduced to the position of slaves, but the ordinary tools that the Indian peasant and worker requires for producing with greater ease and in greater abundance those goods that he and his family and his village need, and which he used to produce until he was sucked into the maelstrom of the big cities, and the slavery of working in a factory owned by either the State or other faceless owners.

In brief, what the Mahatma would have approved of would have been if our industrialization effort had been directed primarily towards improving the social and economic conditions of the common man, by concentrating mainly at least, only on providing our millions of carpenters, blacksmiths, bricklayers and other artisans, progressively with more and more highly developed tools, so that they could use them for their own benefit and of their neighbours, develop their own skills, find their own employment, and live as free men in their own habitat.

Instead of that we have concentrated almost exclusively on trying to enrich the state, completely ignoring the individuals who constitute that state, trying to make the nation powerful and prestigious, forgetting that no nation can become really powerful or prestigious if the bulk of its citizens live in economic misery or in bondage. Indirectly this was done through the agency of both the private and the public sector with disastrous effects on the distribution of national wealth and social equity. The blame for this was then put on the private sector though the public sector was equally, if not more, responsible for it. And now, the emphasis is on making the public sector the great slave-master to whom every worker and peasant must get himself bound in one way or the other, if he is to keep body and soul together. This has made the economic and social position worse, and if the trend is not reversed soon, will completely destroy whatever still survives of our professed Gandhi-

ideals. Economic power and patronage is getting concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, not spread out more evenly as is proclaimed. A whole tribe of politicians and bureaucrats is growing that is even more remote from the common man than the private entrepreneurs and owners of old. Corruption instead of being confined among the few is now spreading down the line of the hordes of public functionaries that have their fingers in the operation of public sector undertakings. They follow the example of their masters and masters at the top and insist on getting a slice of the cake almost before it is baked.

Neither 'voluntary' renunciation nor compulsory renaissance is called for but a concentration on satisfying the needs of the common man, our greatest potential source of wealth and social stability.

If the state, instead of trying to become the step-father and mother of us all, would only devote itself to providing us with the tools that we need to produce what we want we shall be able to work out our own destiny, without either enslaving each other or corrupting ourselves or others, and India will become a happier and more prosperous nation.

WHO'S WHO

Sagare Dasgupta, Gandhian Institute of Studies, Banaras

Dendutt, Editor, *Point of View*, New Delhi

R. R. Dwivedi, Chairman, Gandhi Peace Foundation.

Durgadas, author of *India—From Curzon to Nehru and After*

Prabhuakar Mishra, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi

R. C. Majumdar, General Editor, *The History and Culture of the Indian People*.

D. R. Mukherjee, author of *The Guilty Men of 1948*, etc

B. K. Puri, Sarvodaya Thinker, Nagpur.

K. Rangachari, Indian Institute of Public Opinion, New Delhi.

P. Kodanda Rao, Forum of International Affairs, Bangalore.

Mohi Sen, Communist Party of India

Badr-ed-din Tyabji, Former Indian Ambassador to Japan

School: the sacred cow

IVAN JELICH

THIS IS A TIME OF CRISIS IN THE INSTITUTION of the school, a crisis which may mark the end of the 'age of schooling' in the western world. I speak of the 'age of schooling' in the sense in which we are accustomed to speak of the 'feudal age' or of the 'Christian era'. The 'age of schooling' began about two hundred years ago. Gradually the idea grew that schooling was a necessary means of becoming a useful member of society. It is the task of this generation to bury that myth.

Your own situation is paradoxical. At the end and as a result of your studies, you are enabled to see that the education your children deserve, and will demand, requires a revolution in the school system of which you are a product.

The graduation rite that we solemnly celebrate today confirms the prerogatives which Puerto Rican society, by means of a costly system of subsidised public schools, confers upon the sons and daughters of its most privileged citizens. You are part of the most privileged 10 per cent of your generation, part of that minuscule group which has completed university studies. Public investment in each of you is fifteen times the educational investment in an average member of the poorest 10 per cent of the population, who drops out of school before completing the fifth grade.

The certificate you receive today attests to the legitimacy of your competence. It is not available to the self-educated, to those who have acquired competence by means not officially recognised in Puerto Rico. The programs of the University of Puerto Rico are all duly accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The degree which the university today confers upon you implies that over last sixteen years or more your elders have obliged you to submit yourselves, voluntarily or unvoluntarily, to the discipline of this complex scholastic rite. You have in fact been daily attendants, five days a week,

nine months a year, within the sacred precinct of the school and have consumed such attendance year after year, usually without interruption. Governmental and industrial employers and the professional associations have good reasons to believe that you will not subvert the order to which you have faithfully submitted in the course of completing your 'rites of initiation'.

Much of your youth has been spent within the custody of the school. It is expected that you will now go forth to work, to guarantee to future generations the privileges conferred upon you.

Puerto Rico is the only society in the western hemisphere to devote 30 per cent of its governmental budget to education. It is one of six places in the world which devote between 6 and 7 per cent of their national income to education. The schools of Puerto Rico cost more and provide more employment than any other public sector. In no other social activity is so large a proportion of the total population of Puerto Rico involved.

A large number of people are observing this occasion on television. Its solemnity will, on the one hand, confirm their sense of educational inferiority, and on the other, cause their hopes, largely doomed to disappointment, of one day themselves receiving a university degree.

Puerto Rico has been schooled. I don't say educated but, rather, schooled. Puerto Ricans can no longer conceive of life without reference to the school. The desire for education has actually given way to the compulsion of schooling. Puerto Rico has adopted a new religion. Its doctrine is that education is a product of the school, a product which can be defined by numbers. There are the numbers which indicate how many years a student has spent under the tutelage of teachers, and others which represent the proportion of his correct answers in an examination. Upon receipt of a diploma the educational product acquires a market value. School attendance in itself thus guarantees admission to the membership of disciplined consumers of the technocracy—just as in past times church attendance guaranteed membership in the community of saints. From governor to *jibaro*, Puerto Rico now accepts the ideology of its teachers as it once accepted the theology of its priests. The school is now identified with education as the Church once was with religion.

Today's agencies of accreditation are replacements of the royal patronage formerly accorded the Church. Federal support of education now parallels yesterday's royal donations to the Church. The power of the diploma has grown so rapidly in Puerto Rico that the poor blame their misery on precisely the lack of that which seems to you, today's graduates, participation in society's privileges and powers.

Research shows that twice as many high-school graduates in Puerto Rico as in the United States want to pursue university studies; while the probability of graduating from college for the Puerto Rican high-school

graduate is much lower than it would be in the United States. This widening discrepancy between aspirations and resources can result only in a deepening frustration among the inhabitants of the island.

The later a Puerto Rican child drops out of school the more keenly does he feel his failure. Contrary to popular opinion, increasing emphasis on schooling has actually increased class conflict in Puerto Rico, and has also increased the sense of inferiority which Puerto Ricans suffer in relation to the United States.

Upon your generation falls the obligation of developing for Puerto Rico an educational process radically different from that of the present and independent of the examples of other societies. It is yours to question whether Puerto Rico really wants to transform itself unreservedly into a passive product of the teaching profession. It is yours to decide whether you will subject your children to a school that seeks its respectability in North American accreditation, its justification in the qualification of the labour force, and its function in permitting the children of the middle class to keep up with the Joneses of Westchester County, New York.

The real sacred cow in Puerto Rico is the school. Proponents of communalism, statehood and independence all take it for granted. Actually, none of these political alternatives can liberate a Puerto Rico which continues to put its primary faith in schooling. Thus, if this generation wants the true liberation of Puerto Rico, it will have to invent educational alternatives which put an end to the 'age of schooling'. This will be a difficult task. Schooling has developed a formidable folklore. The hegemonic academic professors whom we have witnessed today evoke the ancient procession of clerics and little angels on the day of Corpus Christi. The Church, holy, catholic, apostolic, is rivaled by the school, accredited, compulsory, unbreakable, universal. Alas Mater has replaced Mother Church. The power of the school to rescue the damned of the slum is as the power of the Church to save the Muslim Moor from hell. (Gehenna meant both slum and hell in Hebrew.) The difference between Church and school is mainly that the rites of the school have now become much more rigorous and onerous than were the rites of the Church in the worst days of the Spanish Inquisition.

The school has become the established Church of secular times. The modern school had its origins in the impulse towards universal schooling, which began two centuries ago as an attempt to incorporate everyone into the industrial state. In the industrial metropolis the school was the integrating institution. In the colonies the school inculcated the dominant classes with the values of the imperial power and confirmed in the masses their sense of inferiority to the schooled class. Neither the nation nor the industry of the post-cybernetic era can be

imagined without universal baptism into the school. The drop-out of the era corresponds to the lapid masonry of eleventh-century Spain.

We have, I hope, outlived the era of the industrial state. We shall not live long, in any case, if we do not replace the authoritarianism of national sovereignty, industrial autarchy and cultural narcissism—which are combined into a stew of leftovers by the schools. Only within these sacred precincts could such old porridge be served to young Puerto Ricans.

I hope that your grandchildren will live in an island where the majority give as little importance to attending class as is now given to attending the Mass. We are still far from that day and I hope that you will take the responsibility for bringing it to pass without fear of being damned as heretic, subversive or ungrateful creatures. It may comfort you to know that those who undertake the same responsibility in socialist lands will be similarly denounced.

Many controversies divide our Puerto Rican society. Natural resources are threatened by industrialization, the cultural heritage is adulterated by commercialization, dignity is subverted by publicity, imagination by the violence which characterizes the mass media. Each of these is a theme for extensive public debate. There are those who want less industry, less English and less Coca-Cola, and those who want more. All agree that Puerto Rico needs many more schools.

This is not to say that education is not discussed in Puerto Rico. Quite the contrary. It would be difficult to find another society whose political and industrial leaders are as concerned with education. They all want more education, directed towards the sector which they represent. Their controversies mainly serve, however, to strengthen public opinion in the scholastic ideology which reduces education to a combination of class-rooms, curricula, funds, examinations and grades.

I expect that by the end of this century, what we now call the school will be an historical relic, developed in the time of the railroad and the private automobile and discarded along with them. I feel sure that it will soon be evident that the school is as marginal to education as the witch doctor is to public health.

A divorce of education from schooling is, in my opinion, already on the way, speeded by three forces: the Third World, the ghettos and the universities. Among the nations of the Third World, schooling discriminates against the majority and disqualifies the self-educated. Many members of the 'black' ghettos see the schools as a 'whitening' agent. Promoting university students tell us that school boxes them and stands between them and reality. These are caricatures, no doubt, but the mythology of schooling makes it difficult to perceive the underlying realities.

The criticism that today's students are making of their teachers is

as fundamental as that which their grandfathers made of the clergy. The divorce of education from schooling has its model in the demythologizing of the church. We fight now, in the name of education, against a teaching profession which unwillingly constitutes an economic interest, as in times past the reformers fought against a clergy which was, often unwillingly, a part of the secular power elite. Participation in a 'production system', of no matter what kind, has always threatened the prophetic function of the Church as it now threatens the educational function of the school.

School protest has deeper causes than the protests evoked by its leaders. These, although frequently political, are expressed as demands for various reforms of the system. They would never have gained mass support, however, if students had not lost faith and respect in the institution which nurtured them. Student strikes reflect a profound situation widely shared among the younger generation: the situation that schooling has vulgarized education, that the school has become anti-educational and anti-social, as in other epochs the Church had become anti-Christian or Israel had become idolatrous. This situation can, I believe, be explicitly and briefly formulated.

The protest of some students today is analogous to the dissidence of those charismatic leaders without whom the Church would never have been reformed: their prophecies led to martyrdoms, their theological insights led to their persecution as heretics, their saintly asceticism often led to the stake. The prophet is always accused of subversion, the theologian of irrelevance and the saint is written off as crazy.

The Church has always depended for its vitality upon the necessity of its bishops to the appeals of the faithful, who see the rigidity of the ritual as an obstacle to their faith. The churches, incapable of dialogue between their ruling clerics and their dissidents, have become museum pieces, and this could easily happen with the school system of today. It is easier for the university to attribute dissidence to ephemeral causes than to attribute the dissidence to a profound alienation of the students from the school. It is also easier for student leaders to operate with political slogans than to launch basic attacks upon sacred cows. The university that accepts the challenge of its dissident students and helps them to formulate in a rational and coherent manner the anxiety they feel because they are rejecting schooling exposes itself to the danger of being ridiculed for its supposed credulity. The student leader who tries to promote in his companions the consciousness of a profound aversion to their school (not to education itself) finds that he creates a level of anxiety which few of his followers care to face.

The university has to learn to distinguish between sterile criticism of scholastic authority and a call for the conversion of the school to the educational purposes for which it was founded, between destructive fury

and the demand for radically new forms of education—scarcely conceivable by minds formed in the scholastic tradition between, on the one hand, cynicism which seeks new benefits for the already privileged and, on the other, Socratic-sarcasm, which questions the educational efficacy of accepted forms of instruction in which the institution is investing its major resources. It is necessary, in other words, to distinguish between the alienated mob and profound protest based on rejection of the school as a symbol of the status quo.

In no other place in Latin America has investment in education, demand for education, and information about education, increased so rapidly as in Puerto Rico. There is no place, therefore, in which members of your generation could begin the search for a new style of public education so quickly as in Puerto Rico. It is up to you to get us back, recognizing that the generations which preceded you were misled in their efforts to achieve social equality by means of universal compulsory schooling.

In Puerto Rico three of every ten students drop out of school before finishing the sixth grade. This means that only one of every two children, from families with less than the median income, completes the elementary school. Thus half of all Puerto Rican parents are under a sad illusion if they believe that their children have more than an outside chance of entering the university.

Public funds for education go directly to the schools, without students having any control of them. The political justification for this practice is that it gives everyone equal access to the class-room. However, the high cost of this type of education, decided by educators trained largely outside Puerto Rico, makes a mockery of the concept of equal access. Public schools may benefit all of the workers but they benefit mainly the few students who reach the upper levels of the system. It is precisely our insistence on direct financing of the "free school" that causes the concentration of scarce resources on benefits for the children of the few.

I believe that every Puerto Rican has the right to receive an equal part of the educational budget. This is something very different from and much more concrete than the mere promise of a place in the school. I believe, for example, that a young thirteen-year-old who has had only four years of schooling has much more right to the remaining educational resources than students of the same age who have had eight years of schooling. The mere "disadvantaged" criterion is, the more he needs a guarantee of his right.

If in Puerto Rico it were decided to honour this right, then the free school would immediately have to be abandoned. The annual quota of each person of school age would obviously not support a year of schooling, at present costs. The insufficiency would, of course, be even

more domains if the total educational budget for all levels were divided among the population from six to twenty-five years of age, the period between kindergarten and graduate studies, to which all Puerto Ricans supposedly have free access.

These facts leave us three options: (a) leave the system as it is, at the cost of justice and conscience, (b) use the available funds exclusively to assure free schooling to children whose parents earn less than the median income, or (c) use the available public resources to offer to all the education that an equal share of these resources could assure to each. The better-off could, of course, supplement this amount and might continue to offer their children the doubtful privilege of participating in the process which you are completing today. The poor would certainly use their share to acquire an education more efficiently and at lower cost.

The same choices apply, a fortiori, to other parts of Latin America where frequently not more than twenty dollars a year in public funds would be available for each child if the 20 per cent of tax receipts now demanded for education were distributed equally to all children who should be in school under existing laws. This amount could never pay for a year of conventional schooling. It would however be enough to provide a good many children and adults with one month of intensive education year after year. It would also be enough to finance the distribution of educational games leading to skills with numbers, letters and logical symbols. And to sponsor successive periods of intensive apprenticeship. In northeast Brazil, Paulo Freire (who was forced to leave the country) showed us that with a single investment of this amount he was able to educate 25 per cent of an illiterate population to the point where they could do functional reading. But this, as he made clear, was only possible when his literacy program could focus on the key words that are politically controversial within a community.

My suggestions may mortally annoy. But it is from the great post-modern and liberals that we inherited the principle of using public funds for the administration of schools directed by postmodernist educators, just as, previously, riches had been given to the Church to be administered by priests. It remains for you to fight the first public school in the name of true equality of educational opportunity. I admire the courage of those of you who are willing to enter this fight.

Youth want educational institutions that provide them with education. They neither want nor need to be mothered, to be coddled or to be indoctrinated. It is difficult, obviously, to get an education from a school that refuses to educate without requiring that its students submit simultaneously to custodial care, sterile competition and indoctrination. It is difficult, obviously, to finance a teacher who is at the same time regarded as guardian, umpire, counselor and curriculum manager. It is

unconscionable to combine these functions in one institution. It is precisely the fusion of these four functions, frequently antithetical, which raises the cost of education acquired in school. This is also the source of our chronic shortage of educational resources. It is up to you to create institutions that offer education to all at a cost within the means of public resources.

Only when Puerto Rico has psychologically outgrown the school will it be able to finance education for all, and only then will truly efficient, non-scholastic forms of education have been designed as provisional means of compensating for the failure of the schools. In order to create new forms of education, we will have to demonstrate alternatives to the school that offer preferable options to students, teachers and taxpayers.

There is no intrinsic reason why the education that schools are now failing to provide could not be acquired more successfully in the setting of the family, of work and communal activity, in new kinds of libraries and other centers that would provide the means of learning. But the institutional forms that education will take in tomorrow's society cannot be clearly visualized. Neither could any of the great reformers anticipate concretely the institutional styles that would result from their reforms. The fear that new institutions will be imperfect, in their turn, does not justify our servile acceptance of present ones.

This plea to imagine a Puerto Rico without schools must, for many of you, come as a surprise. It is precisely for surprise that true education prepares us. The purpose of public education should be no less fundamental than the purpose of the Church, although the purpose of the latter is more explicit. The basic purpose of public education should be to create a situation in which society obliges each individual to take stock of himself and his poverty. Education implies the growth of an independent sense of life and a relatedness which go hand in hand with increased needs to, and use of, resources stored in the human community. The educational institution provides the locus for this process. This presupposes a place within the society in which each of us is awakened by surprise, a place of encounter in which others surprise me with their liberty and make me aware of my own. The university itself, if it is to be worthy of its traditions, must be an institution whose purposes are identified with the sources of liberty, whose autonomy is based on public confidence in the use of that liberty.

My friends, it is your task to surprise yourselves, and us, with the education you succeed in receiving for your children. Our hope of salvation lies in our being surprised by the others. Let us learn always to receive further surprises. I decided long ago to hope for surprises until the final act of my life—that is to say, in death itself.

A gandhian perspective of social change in India since independence

T. K. M. UNNITHAN

A REVOLUTION is considered "a movement-of demand that succeeds in obtaining power". If so, a bloody revolution need not be a revolution, whereas a nonviolent social movement can be a revolution. Using this criterion the Indian national movement led by Gandhi was indeed revolutionary in character, as it resulted in taking the reins of power from the colonial rulers. Yet the purpose of a revolution is lost if there is only a transfer of power between groups at the top. Only the broader objectives of attainment of power can make the definition significant. The possession of power and its utilization in specific ways, more particularly by a minority group, can sow the seeds of dissent among the masses, which ultimately may result in the overthrow of those in power. For a revolution to be beneficial to the people in general, social change has to be the necessary and natural corollary of such a transfer. Mere attainment of power represents only one phase of a revolution; the positive changes generated by that power alone are indicators of the other phases of the revolution. Gandhi wrote as early as in 1931: "To use political power is not an end but one of the means of enabling people to better their conditions in every department of life. Political power means the capacity to regulate national life through national representatives. If then I want political power it is for the sake of the reforms for which the Congress stands. . . . If we were to analyse the activities of the Congress during the past twelve years we would discover that the capacity of the Congress to take political power has increased in exact proportion to its ability to achieve success in the constructive effort. That is to me the substance of power."¹ Thus, for Gandhi, the attainment of full political power, *swaraj*, self-government, and sovereignty, meant the possibility of a complete reconstruction of Indian society. Has Indian society been thus completely reorganized and reconstructed in these twenty-five years since independence? If not, how much of

social change has been actively brought about and how does it stand in relation to the complete transformation of Indian society into the non-violent social order envisaged by Gandhi?

Very few would claim that Indian society stands transformed considerably since independence. It is perhaps true that in a mere quarter of a century only a miracle could have radically changed a tradition-bound society built up over thousands of years. Still, certain changes have taken place and these cannot be ignored. They may be distinguished as natural or induced changes, both of which could be either strategic or peripheral. By natural change we mean change which would have taken place anyhow, due to the impact of world forces, induced or planned change is that which is stimulated through the introduction of ourselves and which may result in certain intended consequences. Those changes which occur as unintended consequences of independent factors will also constitute a part of natural change. Some natural and induced changes are unimportant and inconsequential to the social structure and hence are only peripheral in nature. On the other hand, certain changes, induced or natural, can be of strategic importance in bringing about further changes in the social system. All these types of change have taken place in Indian society since independence. Changes in the economic infrastructure or in the political and social structures are natural. Among these can be counted changes in labour-management relations, agrarian relations, growth of opposition parties, changes in familial, caste and religious institutions etc. We may take it for granted that some of these changes would have taken place anyhow, because of increased urbanization and industrialization, which are universal trends. Yet these changes were speeded up by planned economic measures to augment industrial output, abolition of feudalism and hereditary rights and privileges, the redistribution of wealth on a more egalitarian basis, the promotion of democratic institutions, and the enactment and enforcement of laws to accelerate these processes. These changes are undoubtedly also strategic in the sense that further social changes are possible because of these. Similarly, in the social realm, changes that have taken place in the institutions of family and marriage, caste or religion are only peripheral. Yet some states like Madras are promoting inter-caste marriages and in Kerala the priesthood has been thrown open to Haryans. These are strategic changes and measures which are likely to bring about a radical reconstruction of Indian society.

The extent of the changes that have taken place in Indian society can be analysed with the help of three types of theories of social change, namely, the structural-functional theories, the evolutionary theories and the dialectical and conflict theories. The structural-functional approach envisages the social structure as systems of roles, as relationships that emerge through the interaction of individuals. The social structure is

seen as a function of recurring institutionalized roles. This would not only imply a system of expected norms and obligations and an integral pattern, but also allow non-institutionalized individual variables which constitute the potentiality of change. The evolutionary theory of change lays down that: 'all processes of social change necessarily give rise to changes in overall institutional systems; that all systematic changes that alter the scope of differentiation within the major sphere of a society necessarily result in the institutionalization of a new, more differentiated social order, better adapted to a wider and more variegated environment (of course, under certain circumstances, differentiation may also lead to regression, stagnation, attempts to differentiate or breakdown), and that the institutionalization of structural differentiation would be uniform irrespective of the differences in the concrete expressions of social structure.'¹

The dialectical theories envisage the structure of society as a dynamic system of relationships. The components of social structure are not regarded as categories of stratum, i.e. status, position etc., which have a static constitution, but of oppositional groups, i.e. classes and groups which do not assume a state of system-integration as formulated in functional sociology, but a state of perpetual conflict. Social change is interpreted and analysed through the successive replacement and dominance of these conflict groups through revolutions. Revolutions and crises constitute the essential mechanics of social change. Most of the studies of social change in India have been evolutionary or structural-functional. In this study it is intended to use a dialectical frame of reference, we shall view society as a system of power configuration.

Power is defined by Ogburn² as 'the ability to affect social activities; it is not a thing possessed by social actors but rather a dynamic phenomenon that occurs in all areas of social life'. According to Hawley³ 'every social act is an exercise of power, every social relationship is a power equation and every social group or system is an organization of power. Accordingly it is possible to transmute any system of social relationships in terms of potential or active power'. Perhaps such a transposition is nothing more than the substitution of one terminology for another.⁴ Though we agree with Ogburn's definition that power is a dynamic phenomenon occurring in all areas of social life and not a thing possessed by the actors, possession of certain assets and qualities by the actors makes it possible to predict a pattern of operation of power situations. For example, A's possession of much material wealth in itself is not power, but in a certain situation one can predict that power would generate from A on account of his command over a scarce resource, wealth. Similarly B's religious knowledge in itself is not power, but his capacity to generate power in certain situations depends upon his demonstrated charisma. We should, therefore, examine in this context

not only the actual situations which determine power generation, but also the factors that promote power configurations. Social changes would correspond to changes in the power configurations.

For classification and study of Indian society we can use a tri-sector model: elite, folk and tribal.² The elite are the few leaders and decision-makers who are capable of considerably affecting social activities. The folk, that is the rural and urban middle class which constitutes the bulk of the population and contributes substantially to the maintenance of society, are controlled and regulated in their activities by the decisions of the elite. The tribal sector, constituted by the Adivasis, untouchables and other similar minorities and backward groups, though an integral part of the general society, has nevertheless been kept as a separate cultural entity in many respects. This is not entirely due to its own isolation, but largely to the inhibitions of the rest of society.

Who were the elites in pre-independence India? Who are the elites now? What are the differences in the character of the Indian folk since independence? What is the contemporary situation in regard to the tribal sector of Indian society? Answers to these questions will take us a long way towards understanding social changes in India.

Before independence the elites and the decision-makers were, politically and administratively, the British rulers and their henchmen, economically, the capitalists and feudal lords, and socially, the upper castes. Between them they controlled Indian society. Their interests did not lie in effecting changes, but rather in avoiding them and in maintaining the status quo.³ Any alteration meant loss of privileges. All policies were so designed as to enable the continuation of vested interests and privileges.⁴ This structure was supported and maintained by a powerful army and a militant police force. Any individual or group attempting a reformation was severely dealt with. Efforts were not spared to suppress any mass movement that developed. Moreover, suppression of the Indian masses was easy in view of the 'fatalistic other-worldliness' which existed in the minds of the Hindus who were resigned to accept a static frame of social organisation. Generations of religious teachings had conditioned them to accept a hierarchical, compartmentalised social order based on inequality as a natural situation, the questioning of which could be done only at the cost of violating religious norms. The Hindu religious values, like the doctrine of karma, had reinforced these beliefs and provided a basis for individual satisfaction in conforming to social practices rather than questioning them. Such conditioned people could hardly be expected to initiate changes.

The tribal sector was kept outside the mainstream of Indian society. They were denied even the privileges religiously allowed to those (shudras) who were traditionally expected to do service. They were used as slaves, primarily to increase agricultural output. By paying only

subordinate wages the privileged class used the surplus for their luxuries. Not only were they economically exploited, but they were socially and psychologically suppressed and most of them were treated as outcasts and untouchables. There was no place for them in the power structure. Such was the situation before independence.

After India attained freedom the class structure has undergone a change. With the replacement of the colonial government by self-government and introduction of democratic institutions, political elites began to dominate the class structure. The power of feudal lords and caste/rule rulers began to fade. As private capital was allowed to flourish in spite of the state policy of socialism, it assumed a major role in shoring power balances. Political, business and military interests constituted the real power elites in this country. Though, theoretically, the folk or the masses gave support to the political elites, in actuality the masses did not have any controlling role over them. The power elites were able to so manipulate the masses that the latter became witnesses to their own helplessness. Once they made use of the masses through the democratic institutions, the elites became masters of the situation and began to exercise considerable power and decisively affect social activities.

At the same time the folk structure of society also underwent a transformation. With the liberation of the common man from the clutches of a rigid, stratified social system by abolition of feudalism and hereditary rights, horizontal and vertical mobility became a possibility. Once the ideal of a socialist society had been accepted it became possible to introduce a number of egalitarian measures. Through introduction of adult franchise, democratic decentralisation through Panchayati Raj, and greater possibilities of education, the rural and urban leadership changed hands. The place of hereditary and traditional leaders was taken up by a new generation of leaders who possessed a different set of attitudes and values in contrast to their earlier counterparts. If this new generation can assert itself strongly, it will be able to considerably alter not only the folk structure but also that of the elite, unless, of course, it associates itself with the elites and dissociates itself from the masses, as the current trend indicates.

There has been much less change in the position of the tribal sector. However, the reports that come from many villages regarding conflicts between Harijans and upper caste Hindus are symptomatic of change. Violent clashes are reported from many villages in Rajasthan, as well as from other parts of India. These clashes centre upon the refusal of Harijans to carry out their traditional occupations, like removing dead animals, etc. Before independence such a conflict could hardly occur. In the first place the Harijans would not have questioned their subjugation. They had for generations been made to believe that their plight

was God-ordained, religiously sanctioned and based on the doctrine of karma. Any questioning of it would have been an act against God himself which would have been punishable by God and man alike. Secondly, the upper caste Hindus were so well entrenched in their social privileges, fortified by religious and social sanctions, that any such revolt would have been crushed violently. Now after a quarter of a century of independence the situation is different. The poor and the down-trodden masses of India, who were considered social outcasts, have been given the right to think for themselves and to aspire to the society which hitherto was denied to them. The Indian Constitution and the various governmental measures have made it possible for them to aspire to social positions on the basis of their achievements. Due to the educational and economic opportunities given to the backward classes a new generation is rising. It is this new generation that is at the back of the rural social conflicts. Since the law and the state are on their side, eventually the depressed castes are bound to succeed, even though the upper castes may try to suppress the results. The traditional occupational pattern of villages will be broken and the village social structure will be based on more and more egalitarian norms, in spite of the overt and covert practices of untouchability and other acts of social ostracism that we continue to witness throughout the country. This is symptomatic of a power struggle that is going on. Inter-caste marriages, provision for Harijans, economic and educational measures to improve their material conditions, along with compelling the rest of society to accept these down-trodden people as equal, may eventually result in a radical alteration of the social structure. When this happens the tribal and folk sectors will merge. But such a possibility is far off. What we witness today are just some cracks in the boundary walls that separate the tribes from the rest of society.

Changes in the practice of untouchability, in the caste structure and status of women, the abolition of special privileges and monopolies, the introduction of democratic institutions are all in the direction of a gandhian social order and may be called positive changes. But the gandhian concept of change is essentially voluntaristic and his ideas centre upon the acceptance of dharma as an end as well as a means in all individual and social actions; acceptance of egalitarian values in social, economic and political institutions, in spite of contrary religious-cultural sanctions, simultaneously repudiating all inequalities; belief in God along with the tolerance of different religious faiths; continuous reformation of the individual in terms of the values of non-violence, truth and selfless action in pursuit of truth and non-violence, with a capacity to identify one's own well-being and happiness with those of the entire society. This implies individual reformation and character formation. The surrender of individual interests, for the sake of society, is a necessary

condition for a non-violent social order. Increasing information of individuals in terms of altruistic values is bound to result in social changes which are qualitatively different. If more and more altruistically oriented individuals come to exist, then there will be a change in power configurations also. The change in the power structure will take place not because of state action, but because of voluntary surrender of power. Political leaders and statesmen will renounce positions of authority and prefer social service, like Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan. There will be more and more trustees in the gandhian sense, and less concentration of economic power. There will be more and more Jevandhan, Gramdhan and Bhoodhan. That we witness the opposite trend in society at present shows how far we are from gandhian ideals. The attribute of a qualitatively higher change is its relative permanence. The changes that have occurred are not because of any transformation of society in the direction of altruism, but because of the coercive measures of the state. These changes are not only relatively less permanent, but they are also incapable of producing the larger changes which will take the social order to higher levels of existence. Mayakalis, bloodshed and violence continue to take place, the inculcation of higher values, their precept and practice, seems to be receding, and Gandhi's goal of a classless and stateless society still remains a dream!

1. V. V. Ramana Murti: *Gandhi: Essential Writings*, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1970, p. 133.

2. S. M. Barnett: 'Social Change, Differentiation and Evolution', *American Sociological Review*, June 1964, Vol. 29, No. 3, p. 313.

3. Marvin E. Olsen: *Power in Society*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1970, p. 3.

4. Anna H. Hawley: 'Community Power and Urban Renewal Success', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 68, January 1963, pp. 423-36.

5. T. K. N. Unnithan, Yogendra Singh and Indira Devi, *Towards a Sociology of Culture in India*, Prentice Hall, New Delhi, 1966, Part I.

6. Gunnar Myrdal: *The Challenge of World Poverty*, Penguin International Edition, 1970, p. 15.

7. Gunnar Myrdal: *Asian Drama*, Edition 1970, p. 51, Farrar, New York, 1968 (revised edition).

8. T. K. N. Unnithan: *Gandhi and Free India*, J. B. Wolcott, Groningen, 1935 (revised version).

Experiments in trusteeship management

K. D. TRIPATHI

INDIA IS IN A PROCESS OF 'SOCIO-ECONOMIC REVOLUTION', implying a drastic change in the major social, economic and political institutions, the system of property relations, the forms of production, the legal structure, the type of political organisation and social beliefs or ideologies. The existing capitalist or bourgeois institutions exhibiting certain social beliefs or ideologies are faced with a serious challenge from alternative economic systems. In the wake of rising discontent and the explosion of aspirations and expectations amongst the masses, India has to decide (a) whether its existing system of economic organisation can adapt itself to the changing needs of an egalitarian society through nonviolent means or (b) alternatively, whether it is prepared to accept the Marxist, Fascist or Maoist totalitarian philosophies.

Gandhi's trusteeship

Gandhi advocated the nonviolent transformation of a feudal or capitalist order into an egalitarian one through acceptance of the principle of trusteeship by all owners of property, whether material or human, whether land or capital or talent. Following the Gita concepts of *samgraha* (non-possession) and *samabhava* (equality) and Socrates' principles of equity, Gandhi wanted to prove his trusteeship concept in the realm of economic relations and business management. 'All life is a trust and all power carries with it obligations.'¹ His principle of trusteeship expresses the inherent responsibility of business enterprises to its consumers, workers, shareholders and the community, and their mutual responsibilities to one another.

The basic tenets of his simple, practical trusteeship formula² (as drafted by Prof. M.L. Dantwala and corrected and finalised by Gandhi) are given below.

- (1) Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capi-

latent order of society into an egalitarian one. It gives no quarter to capitalism, but gives the present owning class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption.

(2) It does not recognise any right of private ownership of property, except in so far as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.

(3) It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth.

(4) Thus in the state-regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interests of society.

(5) Just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for the maximum income that would be allowed to any person in society. The difference between such minimum and maximum incomes should be reasonable and equitable, and variable from time to time, so that the tendency would be towards obliteration of the difference.

(6) Under the gandhian economic order, the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed.

Gandhi viewed industry as a 'social factum', a social partnership and a joint enterprise of labour and capital in which both owners and workers were co-trustees of society. Gandhi's whole life was dedicated to establishing a new socio-economic order, based on the principles of non-violence, truth and justice. His precepts of self-sacrifice, devotion to societal aims and application of ethical values to economic welfare released mass energies for new experiments in social change. Although Marx and Gandhi were both opposed to the profit-motivated capitalist society and both had dedicated themselves to the oppressed and the poor, Gandhism differs from Marxism in that while the latter proves the inevitability of socialism with economic arguments, Gandhism accepts it on ethical grounds. Marxism is based on materialism, with confidence in human rationality, Gandhism relies on spirituality and holds that the basis of social progress is not matter but mind. Multiplication of wants is a worthy objective to Marx, sublimation of wants is Gandhi's ideal. Class war and expropriation of private property are the Marxian steps to socialism, the gandhian way is the way of satyagraha and trusteeship.

Gandhi's experiments in trusteeship began as far back as 1894-95 in Natal, where he treated his employees as co-workers and established a partnership firm with them. Be it Polak or Mrs. Polak, Madhynoo, Kallabach, Maganlal or Chhaganlal Gandhi, Gandhi's private law firm grew into a social institution and his clerks became his partners in a great experiment in trusteeship and collective living. Mr. Ritch gave up

his commercial firm to be an armed clerk with Gandhi and a co-worker. Miss Durr became more of a daughter to Gandhi than a mere office stenotypist. Miss Schiman responded to the gandhian method of employment by refusing to draw more than £10 a month and scolded Gandhi when he urged her to take more. Mr Albert West gave up his own press to join the *Indian Opinion* press at Durban on a salary of £10 a month, which was reduced to £5 when he joined Gandhi's Phoenix settlement. On his return to India, Gandhi founded the Navajvan Mudranalaya with the financial support of Shankerlal Banker in July 1919. In 1929, on his sixtieth birthday, Gandhi made a public trust of the Navajvan Karyalaya, with property worth Rs 1 lakh. 'Henceforth all activities of the institution were to be conducted on a self-supporting basis, with the object of preaching nonviolence for the attainment of *swara*, propaganda for *khadi* and *swadeshi* in all walks of life, removal of untouchability and communal unity'.¹⁰ His experiments in labour-management relations in Ahmedabad were extensions of the trusteeship philosophy to the area of industrial relations. Gandhi encouraged Jamsedji Bhai in establishing a Jamsedji Bhai Sewa Trust on August 7, 1942 for the promotion of the health and spiritual and social welfare of man, particularly women, children, villagers, illiterate, backward and suppressed people and for other charitable purposes. In a way, the cluster of public social institutions which he developed for the implementation of his constructive program throughout the Indian freedom struggle was essentially motivated by the principles of trusteeship and social welfare.

Vinoba's experiments of *gramdaan*, *blooda*, *sampatdaan* etc. centre upon the postulate of the trusteeship of the means of production for the establishment of a new social order—*sarvodaya* as propounded by Gandhi. Such experiments, particularly in the field of land relations, are being watched by social philosophers throughout the world.

Experiments in social responsibility

The multi-faced social responsibility of business, towards shareholders, management, labour, the consumer, the state and the community, is often discharged by a variety of approaches, like participative management, shared decision-making, profit-sharing and employee-shareholding schemes. The Bell Telephone Company's objective of paying just salaries, transfer of substantial shareholding to employees in I.C.I. and Comptelco, voluntary dividend limitation and full consultation practised by John Lewis Partnership,¹¹ Rowntree of York and Lincoln Electric Company, and giving of 20-6 per cent of common stock to its employees by Sears Roebuck of Chicago are instances in point where employee participation has been highly beneficial to shareholders. The company can thus be transformed into a social entity through a combination of

public spirit and shared business sense.

The main characteristics of some of these experiments in social responsibility are given below.

John Lewis Partnership. Turned into a co-operative enterprise, the partnership aims at a limited return on capital, fairness to customers, and full partnership with the employees, who are both members and owners of the company and have an effective voice in its affairs, besides sharing in the profits. The company has shown itself capable of dynamic expansion in a very competitive field of retail distribution.

Harold Gurney Printing Works. The company has allotted half of its shares to the employees through a Friendly Society, registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act.

J.T. Dove of Newcastle. Herbert Dove, the proprietor, has given away his controlling ordinary shares to a Pension Fund Trust for the benefit of the employees and to which the local university appoints the trustees.

The Kalamazoo Company of Northfield, Birmingham. The company has a trust to hold shares for the employees and to buy shares, as and when they are available, with the declared intention that 'the firm eventually will be wholly owned by its employee-members and thus achieve a longer independent life than otherwise under private ownership'.

The Glacier Metal Company. The company has made a notable experiment, designed to make management formally more accountable to the managed through the development of representative and legislative systems in its management, together with an appeals procedure, which account for a high degree of internal accountability and control.

Sears, Roebuck & Co. of Chicago. The company launched an employees' share ownership scheme, besides the saving schemes after retirement, under which every employee who has completed one year's service in the company becomes a member of the company's saving and profit-sharing pension fund at the rate of 2 per cent of his salary with matching contribution from employers, or double or treble on the basis of length of service. Normally 11 per cent of the company's net income (in 1968 it was \$41.5 million) is put into the fund which is used for the purchase of the company's shares. The voting rights are exercised through a committee. On retirement, the worker may opt to continue as a shareholder or get cash payment.

The Krupp Experiment. Alfred Krupp drew an agreement 15 days before his death on July 30, 1967. Following his will, on November 29, 1967, the Krupp headquarters definitely announced an Alfred Krupp Von Bohlen Und Halbach Foundation, whereby a joint stock company was formed on January 2, 1968. Gunter Vopeluang, the new head, declared that the firm would never again produce guns, since the company had a bad experience with its weapons business for many decades.

According to agreement, Allied's tax was entitled to \$500,000 annually before the company could meet any other obligations, including those to the Government.⁴

There are some other experiments concerning different concepts of social responsibility, viz. Brown Engineering Co. Ltd., Farmer Service Ltd., P. A. Management Consultants Ltd., Spackley Ltd. (Caravans) in U.K.; The Carlsberg Brewing Co. in Denmark; The Sparks Corporation, The Bookplate Printing Co. in U.S.A.; Unilever in Brant, and Les Constructeurs de Travail (divent) in France.

Carl Zeiss Works experiment

The idea of regulating the relationship between parties in the industry and the community on the basis of trust was introduced in 1886 by Prof. Ernst Abbe in the Carl Zeiss Works, the well-known optical glass factory at Jena in Germany. The constitution of the Zeiss Foundation, which covered its 7,600 working members, operated successfully from 1886 to 1933, when Nazi intervention and the second world war affected its working. By 1933, however, the old technical workers of Jena restored the old Zeiss Foundation at Oberkochen in West Germany.

The first article of the 122-article constitution of the Zeiss Foundation states that the objects of Zeiss are—economic security of the business and its future expansion, well-being of the workers and efficient service to customers, welfare of the neighbourhood, advancement of scientific studies, research, teaching etc.

The Board of Trustees delegate their duties to a deputy, whose office is quasi-judicial and who is appointed for life from the senior ranks of the state service and is consulted by the Boards of Management for different departments on all questions of policy. Each department of the company is administered by three or four managers, who are generally chosen from within the company and must have been members of the firm for at least two years. The members of the Boards of Management are not permitted to have shares in the business and their minimum remuneration is so related to that of workers that it may never exceed ten times the average wage of the latter. Besides bonus, the worker is given security in employment, in that after three years' service with the company, half-a-year's salary has to be paid to him on dismissal, and after five years' service, an employee becomes eligible for pension and is entitled on dismissal to a sum equal to one-eighth of the total wage or salary earned during his service. Everyone working in the Foundation knows that he is not working for persons more or less foreign to the working community, but for the preservation of the enterprise with which his future is intimately linked and for the community.

Scott Bader Commonwealth and Democracy Experiment

Ernest Bader, who went to Britain from Switzerland during 1904-05, transferred the ownership of his small but prosperous firm manufacturing industrial chemicals—£2 million annual sales and a complement of over 100 people—to its employees. The affairs of the company are administered by a Community Council of twelve—one of them elected by secret ballot from among members, two appointed by the Board of Directors, and the twelfth a prominent personality of the neighbourhood. The experiment of the Scott Bader Commonwealth has been extended through Democracy¹—the Society for Democratic Integration in Industry, consisting of over 120 supporting members, with seven operating companies as practitioners. They function on the basis of the following principles of Democracy.

- (1) Every undertaking should be carried on as a joint concern by all those working for it forming an organic cooperative group bound together for some necessary social purpose.
- (2) An undertaking to be socially healthy will (a) treat every human being in it as an individual to be helped to develop his or her full capabilities and talents within the discipline of a shared purpose, (b) control its size (number limited to 250 by articles) or, in the case of a larger firm, decentralise its activities so that everyone is able to embrace them in his mind and imagination; (c) seek to establish mutually helpful relations with those who use its products and with the community in which it is situated, realising that it is part of a national or international community with responsibilities beyond its own immediate interests.
- (3) There must be a closely defined partnership, which may take various forms, between those who contribute leadership, management, capital, technical skill and any kind of labour of hand or brain and in which each will have recognised status, duties and rights without any exploitation of man by man and without any section having an exclusive right to ownership, control or profits.
- (4) The form of ownership and control of the business must, therefore, make legal provision for the whole body to express the principle of democratic integration and a sense of belonging by all its members.

The philosophy of the experiment may be summed up as integrating workers as co-owners with management; union between private capital and social capital; collective ownership; transformation of commercial responsibility into co-responsibility, and a brotherly social climate and a feeling of belonging as in a family. Democracy principles and others represent an ideological transformation of industry into living communities and basic democracies, where the company is chartered and

consisted in a form of common-ownership of the means of production. Democracy is designed to cultivate and supercede the best features of both capitalism and communism, balanced self-interest and creative aspiration based on ownership of the means of production. What is required is the 'will' and 'dare' to realize a radical change in economic life, making such commitment a basic plank in the search for a better society.

Some of the distinctions between a conventional company and a Democracy commonwealth are obvious. While a conventional company bestows absolute power in the hands of a Board of Directors, the constitutional power in a Democracy commonwealth is vested jointly in the workers, who become members of the commonwealth and not merely wage-slaves and have direct participation in management. While in a conventional company even the schemes of profit-sharing do not change the wage-employee relationship (even workers holding shares do not feel they are proprietors), the constitution of Democracy demands 60 per cent profits for ploughing back, 20 per cent for distribution to commonwealth members and 2 per cent for Democracy educational and charitable causes. While managerial power and power for disciplinary action lie with the Board of Directors in a conventional company, in a Democracy a council of sixteen—eight of whom are elected by the members of commonwealth—is responsible for settling questions of injustice or disputes, with powers of decision over internal affairs. While earning of maximum profits for the shareholders is the chief motive behind the operations of a conventional company, the triple objectives of expansion and broadening of activities, additional income to members and increased social contribution are the spiritual motives behind Democracy. While in a conventional company shareholders hold shares as individual property and generally exercise voting rights once at the annual general meeting only, all shares in a Democracy commonwealth are held jointly by management and workers alike and the capital is thereby socialized or neutralized in terms expressed in the constitution by common agreement. In fact, no single person owns any shares. In a conventional company, the corporation has no soul or conscience and is based on the outmoded concept of the master-servant relationship with a hierarchical organizational structure, a type of neo-feudalism. The great king of money power—represented by a group of people intent on making money—sits on his industrial throne with clerks in charge of the various ministerial departments and cars, knights, squares and seats in their proper places on the grand organizational tree. In Democracy, the corporate conscience is reflected in the family spirit, through building of one as a centre of collective energy and through harmonizing itself by the distributive process. The wage yoke is eliminated and employers are not treated as gods or mere cyphers or calculated as labour cost, but enjoy equality of status at the individual level, anchored as they are

in a constitution based on the ideals of Christian brotherhood

The participating company

George Geyder suggests reforms which would 'bring the voice of workers, customers and community into the councils of big business, not as a grace but as of right'.⁷ His main proposal, in the context of the U.K. environment, is for a new type of limited liability company to be known as a participating company. Such a company would have a general purpose clause in its Memorandum specifying its social responsibilities, workers would be made members of the company and enjoy parallel rights to those of shareholders, dividends would be subject to compulsory limitation, and provision would be made for an independent social audit of its activities. The company articles would provide for the representation of these interested both on the Board and at the Annual General Meeting and for submission to the trustees appointed by the Board of Trade any dispute between the directors and other interests. Any company could establish a social audit voluntarily by placing an adequate amount in the hands of four trustees, to be appointed by the company, the trade union council, the Board of Trade and independent bodies. Such an audit may enquire into the company's pricing policies as affecting consumers, labour policies as affecting employees and trade unions, and community policies.

Allen Flinders doubts⁸ that the problems of social responsibility can merely be solved by writing a general purposes clause into the Memorandum of a participating company. According to him, law cannot override the social realities of industry. If the industry lacks a common purpose, the state cannot give it one. The law may be used to suppress the free expression of conflict, as in totalitarian countries, merely on the pretence of common purpose.

Trusts in India: the experience

Some of the renowned captains of Indian industry claim that their industrial and business enterprise was but a trust held in the interests of the community at large. There is no denying the fact that some enlightened entrepreneurs have created trusts for charitable and public purposes out of the profits of their enterprises and have set high standards in labour welfare and other social obligations. Leading Indian business houses like Tata, Mahalal, Godrej, Khatau, Alkesh, T.V. Sundaram, Kirlankar, Birla, Birla-Hindler, Banger, Jardine-Henderson and others can be mentioned in this regard.

In India, according to a survey⁹ on the working of trusts conducted by the Department of Company Affairs, Government of India, out of 75 trusts (with above Rs 1 lakh of total assets) surveyed, 62 were for charitable and public purposes with total assets of Rs 37 crore. 61 trusts

were associated with business groups. Though most of the charitable and public purpose trusts have laudable objectives, such as advancement of learning, research, distress relief, running of hospitals, advancement of public welfare etc., they generally do not conform to the standards required under the concept of trusteeship as would be evident from the following table incorporating the position with regard to trusts with assets of above Rs 1 crore in 1963-64.

Business group	No of trusts	Assets (Rs crores)	Investments in same group	PERCENTAGES	
				Investments in other groups	Buildings and government securities
Malafal	16	2.4	33.67	—	30.64
Birla	8	7.5	23.40	5.19	4.41
Tata	6	4.4	90.21	2.17	7.62
Hind-Belger	3	2.9	83.33	1.18	8.34
Bangar-laudmo-	2	1.04	52.06	28.65	14.52
Henderson	1	2.3	28.82	53.75	17.19

Vijay Merchant has experimented¹² with the trusteeship concept in his own enterprises, Hindustan Spinning and Weaving Mills, Bombay, where 'he has looked upon his workers' problems, needs and difficulties purely from a humanitarian angle, considering that the employee is not merely a means of production but above all a human being first and always'. Following this approach, Merchant looked after his workers and their families from the economic, social and medical points of view. The results have been satisfactory. The experiment costs approximately Rs 50,000 a year, barely .01 per cent of the total sales, the amount being considered an investment in the goodwill of labour. The concrete outcome has been that the shortcomings in all the departments of the mills have come down considerably and every worker is conscious of the fact that defects in production reduce the productivity of the mills.

Dr Lohia's model: the trust corporation

Dr Ram Manohar Lohia, the avowed Gandhian socialist, proposed an Indian Trusteeship Bill¹³ in the Lok Sabha in March 1967 with a view to providing an opportunity to owners of private and public companies (initially with a subscribed capital of more than Rs 10 lakh and/or employment of 500 persons) to function on the basis of the principles of democratic management¹⁴ and the concept of trusteeship as envisioned

by Gandhi. Though the Bill could not be taken up by the Lok Sabha on technical grounds, for reasons of government objection and the untimely death of Dr Lohia, the model as laid down by him outlines the processing and administration of a Trust Corporation, should India sincerely wish to try the experiment.

The salient features of Dr Lohia's model of a Trust Corporation may be enumerated as follows.

(1) A company may by a resolution in its general meeting, passed by a majority of its shareholders present and voting, declare itself to be a Trust Corporation.

(2) The Registrar, Joint Stock Companies, shall arrange to take stock of the assets and liabilities of the company and shall constitute a panchayat of trustees to supervise, control and direct the internal managing trustee. The panchayat shall consist of not more than 14 trustees made up as follows:

- (i) Shareholders to elect at the general meeting: 5 trustees.
- (ii) Trade union of the company to elect 5 trustees (one from the managerial staff, one jobber and the rest from other sections of the staff).
- (iii) The Registrar may appoint 5 Trustees, consisting of an expert each from:

- (1) Planning Commission (for coordination of Corporation activities with the national plan),
- (2) Ministry of Commerce and Industry;
- (3) Department of Company Law Administration;
- (4) Department of Labour of the State Government,
- (5) A member of the Municipal Committee or Corporation within whose jurisdiction the head office of the company is situated.

(iv) The internal managing trustee ex-officio.

(3) The panchayat shall decide all major questions relating to the management of the business of the Trust Corporation. It shall frame rules, approve its annual production plans and annual accounts, take decisions on reconstructions, purchases, sales, loans, orders, wages, salaries, bonus to employees and interest, if any, to shareholders. The panchayat shall elect a chairman from amongst its members. The panchayat shall supervise the work of the managing trustee, examine his reports and give him instructions for general conduct of the work.

(4) The net profit of the Corporation, after due provisions, shall be credited to the Income Tax slice of the Ministry of Finance, to be allocated to the different states according to the recommendations of the Finance Commission.

(5) The employees of the Trust Corporation shall not demand any

rise in wages which is not commensurate with the earnings of an average villager or the uniform scales of wages determined by the Ministry of Labour.

(6) Works Committees of employers shall be formed in every department of the Trust Corporation for explaining decisions of the panchayat to employees, maintenance of discipline and execution of welfare schemes of the Trust Corporation.

(7) The first managing trustee shall continue in office for five years or till the age of 60 and can be removed by the panchayat for criminal breach of trust. His remuneration shall be fixed by contract between him and the panchayat. The first managing trustee may recommend a successor to his office but the final appointment shall be made by the panchayat.

(8) The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited by the Auditor-General of India and shall be placed before a joint annual general meeting of all employees of the Trust Corporation and all the shareholders of the company.

(9) Any industry or undertaking whose management has been taken over by the Government under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act 1951 and entrusted to the Registrar may be treated as a Trust Corporation. New Trust Corporations may be floated *ad initio* by an individual entrepreneur investing 50 per cent of the subscribed capital, the Government contributing the other half and the total equity not exceeding Rs 20 lakh.

The above outlines of a Trust Corporation are sketchy and need comprehensive statutes providing for ownership and management of trusteeship business, which as Gandhi had hoped 'would be a gift from India to the world'. Gandhi admitted that trusteeship is an idea perhaps impossible of complete realization but not on that account a legal fiction. The perfection of trusteeship may mean the total repudiation of the idea of property and in that sense perfect trusteeship is like Euclid's definition of a point, an abstraction, and therefore equally unattainable, but if we strive for it, we may go forward further towards realising equality on earth than by any other method. The basic question that confronts Indian management today is 'Must we allow ourselves to be swept away by the law of economic determinism or can we evolve a society in which there is a blending of the essence of our heritage and the products of science and technology?' The affluent Americans,¹⁸ the acquisitive Englishmen, the avaricious Russians and the aggressive Chinese will not heed our pious talk about the philosophy of trusteeship. As long as we do not practice what we preach, the world will continue to consider us either knaves or fools or perhaps both.

1. 'A trust is the relationship which arises whenever a person called a trustee is compelled to hold property, whether real or personal and whether by legal or equitable title, for the benefit of some persons (*Creditors of a trust*) or some object permitted by law, in such a way that real benefit of the property accrues, not to the trustee, but to the beneficiaries or other objects of the trust.'

2. *Margan*, October 15, 1962. Reproduced in original, with Gandhi's annotations, in India International Centre, *Social Responsibility of Business*, pp. 21-22, Mumbai, Bombay.

3. *Wadhvani, Mahatma*, Vol. 2, p. 203.

4. For details, please consult: Flinders, Pomeroy and Woodward, *Experiments in Industrial Democracy: A Study of the John Lewis Partnership* (Pitman and Faber Ltd., 1962).

5. Wilhoit Manchester, 'The Arms of Krups (1857-1957)', *Impulse*, October, 1962.

6. For details, please consult India International Centre, *Social Responsibility of Business*, pp. 139-176, Mumbai, Bombay.

7. O. Gwyer, *The Responsible Company* (Oxell Blackwell, 1961).

8. India International Centre, *Social Responsibility of Business*, pp. 229-236, Mumbai, Bombay.

9. 'Working of Trusts in India, A Survey', *Company News and Notes*, Annual Number 1976, Department of Company Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi.

10. Vijay Morebani, *Trusteeship Management*, Economic and Scientific Research Foundation, New Delhi.

11. The Bill could not be presented in the Lok Sabha because the President of India did not accord permission for presentation under Constitution provision 107 (1). For details of the Indian Trusteeship Bill, please consult, *Am. (Hindi Monthly)*, September-October 1969.

12. Prof. Kenneth Walker in his *Trusts Management Lectures*, 1976 has propounded four forms of Industrial Democracy: democratisation of ownership, democratisation of the government of the enterprise, democratisation of the forms of employment, and democratisation of management.

13. I am certain that we are on the right track, because American businessmen are rapidly developing a sense of trusteeship. The public is uppermost in the minds of most people who are running companies today. Of course, operating at a profit is our first responsibility. That is the basis of what we do. But beyond that, management and directors increasingly look at their role as a public trust. Prof. Donald E. David, former Dean of Harvard Business School (quoted by Don. H. Ford Jr. in *Management Affairs in a New Society*, McGraw Hill, N.Y., p. 16).

Imperatives of education for liberation

K. P. BHADURANA

WHATEVER ADJECTIVES AND APPELLATIONS may be attached to education, they can make no difference to its objective. The cardinal aim of education for man is 'development of the self'. This process of self-realisation is such as helps one's fullest expression without dependence upon any outward agency. Being a living organism, man, by nature, is self-developing. Education has only to help this process of development. Man in India in the second century B.C. had declared the two aims of education to be *vaiśa* (virtue) and *śāśva* (perseverance). And this has been corroborated also by modern educationists like Koss and Nuss. These educationists have also talked of the two attributes of the human mind, namely, the power of recollection (*mneme*) and the clan vital (*thymos*). The development of man's potentialities constitutes his very becoming. Man has a natural right to be, or to become, what he is. The acceptance of this right constitutes the correct foundation of education. Therefore, education is not imparted, it is received, it is not making others learn but learning oneself. Vascha has pointed out that the word 'teaching' does not occur in the ancient Indian texts on education, but 'learning' does. 'Teaching' is artificial, whereas 'learning' is natural. Our education should be natural, not artificial. Hence, instead of making others learn, education has to become a process of learning. Such education alone can guarantee the freedom of man. From this point of view, education is a far wider proposition than mere literacy. This is what led Gandhi to describe education as a process 'from the womb to the grave'. Bookish knowledge and literacy are mere glimpses of education, just as only a part of the iceberg is outwardly visible, with the bulk of it remaining submerged in water. Education, in fact, is the creation of such an atmosphere as would give one the opportunity, the tools and the inspiration to become a man. According to an ancient Indian definition it is the condition in which an

individual learns the art of becoming a *parusha*. Hence education can also be termed as that which liberates one from the shackles which hinder the process of becoming a man. In a word 'education is that which liberates', as *vidya ya vimuktaye*. The liberation of man must free him from all impediments whatever. The highest endeavour both for the individual and society is the freedom of man. It should be kept in mind that we are talking of the freedom of man and not of the individual. The Indian system of thought distinguishes man from an individual.

Education so far has failed to deliver the goods; instead of making man free, it has, as Rousseau said, only put him in chains. And these chains today have become a part of man's culture. Every society seeks to achieve its ends largely through its educational policy and programs. But nowhere in the world today is education able to achieve the desired social goals. This has led to stark dissatisfaction and anarchy in both education and society. The education of today has failed both in realising its objective and in fulfilling national aspirations. The reasons are mainly two. First, it led to a limitless increase in man's aspirations without leading to a concurrent increase in his potentialities and capabilities. The disintegration of man began by the defect of education has been intensified by the help accorded to it by science. Man has today overcome the vast distances of the earth but the gulf that separates him from his neighbourhood is widening. Education and science are both engaged in working for affluence, whereas what we need is richness. The result is that the world is sick with the frightening 'poverty of affluence'. This situation has certainly led to the affluence of nations but it has also brought along a concurrent pauperism of man.

Secondly, since man and society are tied by mutual relationships, misuse of these leads to their disintegration. The systems of education as they are today have absolutely no regard for human relationships. Whatever semblance of relationship there may be, is negative. The result is that the natural as also the extraneous balance between man and society or the nation has been disturbed. The higher educational institutions, in fact, are engaged in creating and promoting this sort of imbalance. They have become cradles for these defects of education and hotbeds of violence, suppression, exploitation and corruption. Life there is suffocated, since monopoly and drabness constitute their only function.

While this situation is doing measurable harm to society, we also find a small minority class extracting the utmost profit out of it and making an organised effort to maintain it. Which is this class? The class in power, of course. The class with the help of the law, wealth and arms is determined to make society its slave. Never have differences between the power-class and the people been so glaring as today.

Where there exists a dictatorship or a monarchy, the fight is for democracy, but where democracy already exists it is for the freedom of the people. High time that in the fight between power and freedom, education should decide in the latter's favour. In Gandhi, India had a man who in the fight between power and freedom declared his unstated support to freedom and for whom education was the medium for its attainment. He devised for a free human society an educational system which he called 'Basic Education'. John Dewey hailed Gandhi's system as the 'greatest discovery so far in the field of education'. Today thinkers like Yaneva and J. Krishnamurti are advocating a similar type of education. Education for freedom is the need of the hour.

This type of education has three basic requirements. First, it should be accepted that a free social order can be created only by free human beings brought up on a system of education free from the baseful influences of the state and business. Education and science are today dominated by these two forces, where once religion held sway. But if education and science are dominated and controlled by either religion, wealth or government they will create only slavery, fear, lawlessness, suppression and exploitation. Religion, wealth and political power have centred in the same individual or group, and this phenomenon has given birth to a strange form of dictatorial power. We agree with Paulo Freire when he says that the entire present system of education only nourishes this totalitarianism. Mistaking this slavery as culture, man is speedily becoming adept at it. Now as always, whenever a fight has been carried on, it is directed not at freedom but strangely enough at the 'ownership of slavery'. These so-called fighters, often mistakenly labelled revolutionaries, have never disowned the values of slavery, what they fight for is nothing else but 'ownership of slaves'. If this had not been so the French Revolution would not have given birth to Napoleon and the Russian to Stalin. The so-called revolutionary events in Russia, Latin America, Africa, China or elsewhere have given rise only to human slavery and nurtured it. China witnessed its revolution in 1949, but even so there arose the need for a cultural revolution which also failed. These events were not directed towards the freedom of man or the establishment of a free social order. It is in the nature of a revolution to be essentially cultural, and hence educational. It cannot take place through uneducational media or in an uneducational atmosphere. The second fundamental condition of education for freedom is that it cannot be achieved through wealth, weapon or power.

As said earlier, power and education are incompatible terms. Education incorporates the unconditional freedom of man, whereas power aims at creating followers or slaves. The latter considers the granting of freedom as its byproduct whereas freedom is never granted, it is naturally acquired. Due to this fundamental dichotomy the state allows

freedom to its citizens only so long as this freedom does not pose a threat to it. Whenever and wherever the criteria pose this threat, the powers that be, whether national or foreign, suppress them with all their strength. As weapons get more and more formidable and sophisticated, as the demand for disarmament, though not out of rationality so much as out of fear, increases, as wars become more and more meaningless, uneconomic and unfeasible, the iron grip of governments and their harassment, suppression and exploitation of their own people will intensify. This process will lead to the disappearance of whatever residue of democracy there may be and to the rise of totalitarianism on a lasting basis. The queer phenomenon is that totalitarianism, militarism and autocracy have flourished everywhere irrespective of their being a democracy, dictatorship or monarchy. Armaments are today utilized less for defence and more for suppressing people inside the country. This situation can be countered not by armament, wealth or state power but by the ceaseless efforts of organized and classless communities. This is another imperative of education for liberation.

Another aspect will have to be considered. The cardinal principle of education is liberation, whereas state power is inherently opposed to it. This is one valid reason that education cannot be entrusted to state power. But even if we presume the presence of enlightened and unattached rulers like Janaka (regarded as vidha or unconcerned about his body and one facts unattached to the state), the level of consciousness attained by humanity today, is such that it cannot and should not be brought down to the level of a "Guardian Father". To attempt this would amount to turning the wheels of progress backwards. The glamour attached to rulers (ill recently the halo surrounding the head, common in pictures of religious reformers and secessionists, was found in pictures of rulers as well) is fast on the wane. Thus, keeping education aloof from power is in tune with the spirit of the times. There is another reason for this. Governments now as always are never representative of the entire mass of the people, but only of a few individuals, groups or political parties; and they utilize education only to serve their own narrow ends. This is the reason that histories are often re-written. Here democratic and non-democratic governments act alike. Hence education fails to become all-embracing and universal.

Similarly, education has to be freed from business. An objective study of the researches in the fields of science and education will make it clear that they benefit only traders, industrialists and middlemen. Our universities and industrial institutes are busy inventing such techniques of advertisement and publicity, media of communication and medicines and methods of treatment (in the name of health and physical well-being) in order to guide and control the subconscious mind of the customer and make him buy the desired product or the technique

of the seller. Business and government have now joined hands with a view to twisting man's thinking in a desired way. In the past business did the same with dharma (religion) also. When religion got transported to the market, it became a commodity and lost its potentialities. Religion today does not view man as something emanating from God; it views him only as a customer. Business also views man as a customer, and the government views him as a voter. The teacher is also being looked upon as a commodity. This is the process of the dehumanisation of man. In order to achieve freedom, education has to be delivered from the clutches of both business and government.

This leads us to the third imperative: the slogan-call 'Teachers of the world unite!' Such teachers as have made the search for knowledge (knowledge being another name for truth) their religion and vocation will have to unite and warn the wealthy and the powerful to keep their hands off education. But where else, are such teachers to be found? Teacher, scientist, artist or thinker—all have either become courtiers sycophanting those in power or are engaged in intellectual prostitution. If it were not so, they would not have sunk so low in the eyes of society and of their own students who even disdain helping them in their material and provisions. The teacher of today is afraid of his own students and often gets beaten by them. Such teachers have not only contributed to the moral disintegration of the students, but have also become supporters of the status quo which rightly angers today's youth. They have lost the faith of their students, the only prop of a teacher. Those few teachers who have audaciously earned this faith are respected both by their students and by society.

If teachers today have lost favour, it is their own fault. They have lost faith both in their religion, which is education, and their profession, which is teaching. They resort to suppression and inducements instead of explaining their viewpoints to the students and the people. They are more interested in fighting municipal, assembly or parliamentary elections than in teaching. A teacher considers a political leader, an administrator or a wealthy person to be more responsible than himself. One who is not self-respecting cannot respect others. The teacher has pinned his faith on politics and business instead of education, and that is why our educational institutions have become the abode of political gossipings. This is nothing but atheism. (I am here using the word 'atheism' not in the sense of rejection of God but of *looma*, i.e. action.) And this lack of faith cannot lead to any fruitful work. It is imperative, therefore, that teachers should turn to the Sophist doctrine: "Know thy own self".

According to Vincha, if teachers of the world could forge a unity and remaining neutral, fearless and truth-teaching, develop a system of knowledge and knowledge-based action, education for freedom might be

come a possibility. In any future society of man as to trust liberty, equality and fraternity as his constant guides, the teacher will have to be the moulder and cooperation and education will form the method and the technique. A society based on power has weapons as the implements and the soldier as the regulator; but one based on cooperation (such a society is bound to be democratic and equalitarian) will have education as the implement and the teacher as the regulator. These ideas of Dharmadas Mazumdar are worth considering.

In such an organized community of teachers, a teacher must have faith in his vocation, i.e. education; he must be a teacher and a supporter of total truth, i.e. he must eschew party-politics of any sort as these represent only partial truth and hence are supporters of untruth; he must recognize the entire society as his field of work. Such a community of teachers, suggests Varsha, should be respected and recognized as the judiciary, if not more.

The important question is not what and how to teach but what for. And this is the crucial point which education and its organizers have been tactfully avoiding and on which even teachers have ceased to think. But unless this question is solved, the other problems will elude solution. If once the aims of education become crystal clear to us then since education and society have a common goal, the means for their fulfilment can be found easily. The problem is defining the goals of society. Total anarchy in this field is the order of the day. The social goals can no longer be defined or realized by religion as it has lost its capacity to do so; nor by power of arms as such power is corrupt and anti-people and has gloriously been exposed as the very negation of man. Power of arms is no strength at all as it is only remnant of man's savage past. This is a task that can be performed only by education, an education free from the power of arms, of wealth and of the state. Freedom of education, therefore, needs today such a worldwide movement as may harness education for this new type of constructive defiance. Education has not to demonstrate the way for individuals or for society as that will constitute a negation of man's right. It has simply to work as a guide for humanity.

Meditations on Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed—III

THOMAS MYSEL

I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST

THE HOLY GHOST IS GOD IMMANENT, God pervading the universe, and therefore the deity, the soul of man, what Socrates called his daemon, what the Quakers call the inner light. 'Know ye not,' wrote St Paul, 'that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?'¹

Gandhi maintained that if in striving to become a perfect shraman and experience the supreme identity you completely efface yourself, reducing yourself to zero, you can, by heeding the still small voice within you, receive guidance from the ultimate reality. In fact he was sure that he frequently had such promptings. Here is his description of one of them.

'It relates to my 21 days' fast for the removal of untouchability. I had gone to sleep the night before without the slightest idea of having to declare a fast the next morning. At about 12 o'clock in the night something wakes me up suddenly and some voice—within or without I cannot say—whispers, "Thou must go on a fast." "How many days?" I ask. The voice again said, "Twenty-one days." "When does it begin?" I ask. It says, "You begin tomorrow." That kind of experience has never happened in my life before or after that date. "My mind was unprepared for it, disinclined for it. But the thing came to me as clearly as anything could be."² 'I saw no form . . . But what I did hear was like a voice from afar and yet quite near. It was as unmistakable as some human voice definitely speaking to me and irresistible. I was not dreaming at the time I heard the voice. The hearing of the voice was preceded by a terrific struggle within me. Suddenly the voice came upon me. I listened, made certain it was the voice and the struggle ceased. I was calm . . . The determination was made accordingly, the date and hour

of the fact stated.¹⁴

The Mahatma maintained that, although God, the Truth, can appropriately be regarded as personal by those who need that belief, the mystery is not in essence a person. But, as is learned from the three above quotations, the Truth is certainly, according to the Indian leader, an entity with which one can have a personal relationship, what the celebrated modern Jewish philosophers, Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber, named an 'I and Thou relationship'. Determined, like the Bishop of Woolwich and other present-day theologians, to avoid a naive anthropomorphism at all costs, Gandhi sympathized with the Lord Buddha, who shunned needless metaphysical speculation and has, as a result, often been mistakenly thought to be an atheist. 'I have heard it contended times without number,' the Mahatma avowed, 'and I have read in books also claiming to express the spirit of Buddhism that Buddha did not believe in God. In my humble opinion such a belief contradicts the very central fact of Buddha's teaching. In my humble opinion the confusion has arisen over his rejection, and just rejection, of all the base things that passed in his generation under the name of God. He undoubtedly rejected the notion that a being called God was actuated by malice, could repent of his actions, and like the kings of the earth could possibly be open to temptations and bribes and have favourites. His whole soul rose in mighty indignation against the belief that a being called God required for his satisfaction the living blood of animals in order that he might be pleased, animals who were his own creation. He, therefore, reinstated God in the right place and deposed the usurper who for the time being seemed to occupy the White Throne. He emphasized and redeclared the eternal and unalterable existence of the moral government of the universe. He unhesitatingly said that the law was God Himself.'¹⁵

Gandhi was first and foremost a man of prayer. He fervently proclaimed that if one is to advance spiritually, then, obeying the urge of the inner voice, one must every day indulge in prayer both public and private. 'Prayer', he wrote, 'is the only means of bringing about orderliness and peace and composure in our daily acts'.¹⁶ 'It is a longing of the soul. It is a daily admission of one's weakness.'¹⁷ 'Begin, therefore, your day with prayer, and make it so useful that it may remain with you until the evening. Close the day with prayer so that you may have a peaceful night free from dreams and nightmares. Do not worry about the form of prayer. Let it be any form, it should be such as can put us into communion with the divine. Only, whatever be the form, let not the spirit wander while the words of prayer run on out of your mouth.'¹⁸ 'In heartfelt prayer the worshipper's attention is concentrated on the object of worship, so much so that he is not conscious of anything else besides.'¹⁹

In his autobiography *Prarambhata* Yogananda recorded the fact that, on his asking Gandhi what, should one find oneself confronted by a cobra, one should do, the Mahatma indicated that one ought to be able, instead of killing it, to calm it by emitting vibrations of love, a procedure which, as the Indian leader at the same time pointed out, it is extremely difficult to follow. And when questioned, just before his assassination, about the stern bomb, the Mahatma said, "I would meet it by peaceful action. . . I would come out in the open and let the pilot see that I had not the face of evil against him. The pilot would not see my face at such a height, I know. But the longing in my heart that he will not come to harm will reach up to him and his eyes would be opened. Of those thousands who were done to death in Hiroshima by the bombs—if they had died with that peaceful action, died openly with prayer in their hearts without uttering a groan, then the war would not have ended as disgracefully as it has."¹⁰ Thus Gandhi believed that, by exercising a benevolent telepathy and thereby cooperating with the mighty love force of the cosmos, you can influence other living things for their good.

Once upon a time, while Jesus and his disciples were crossing the Sea of Galilee, there arose a heavy squall and, as a result, the waves broke over the boat and swamped it. Jesus being asleep on a cushion in the stern, the others roused him and acquainted him with the very serious danger. Thereupon he stood up, rebuked the wind and said to the water, "Hush. Be still." And at once there was a dead calm. In his book, *Mynta Christianity or the Inner Teachings of the Master*, a work about Jesus, Yogi Ramacharaka, commenting on this incident, maintained that according to the occultal occultists it is of great assistance, if one desires mentally to produce an effect upon person or thing, to express one's wish in the form of a command, that ensuring the maximum concentration of thought. No doubt, should one couch the wish in language of intercession with ultimate reality, there could be brought about within one a similar mental intensity.

Note this couple of sayings attributed to Jesus. "These signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."¹¹ "He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do."¹²

In Gandhi's ashram the morning service, which was held at 4.30 a.m., consisted of the recitation of Hindu verses, the singing of a hymn, the repetition of the name of God and the reading of the *Bhagavad-gita*, the last item so arranged that the book was finished every few days, while at the evening service there was first the recitation of the final mantram verses of the second chapter of the *Gita*, then a hymn, and

then the repetition of the name of God. Although these congregational religious exercises were in their construction predominantly Hindu, most of the adherent members being of course of that persuasion, avowedly scriptural texts of other world religions were used as well. In the passage read at the evening service, the last sixteen verses of the second chapter of the Gita, the characteristics of the *sthita-prajna*, that is to say the man of stable understanding, are described, characteristics which, according to the Mahatma, should always be displayed by the true atheist.

When an individual performs his devotions alone, it is essential that he should enjoy privacy, freedom from hurry and the absence of cares and, although customarily commonly sit with legs crossed for the task, we of the west find it more satisfactory to sit in a chair or so kneel. I personally prefer to sit in a chair. We Christians have been taught that private prayer should consist of praise, petition, intercession and confession.

Confession can conveniently be made at night and, when this is done, there is no need for you, prostrating before an imagined dictator, deny, flatteringly to implore him for mercy, pity and pardon. Just look quietly back over the day, calmly count your failures and then condemn them utterly. That is enough.

It is sometimes argued that God the infinite, the marvellous artificer of the vast universe, does not wish to be flattered with the praises of us puny earth mortals, and that, as he knows what we want, it is naive to poster him for this and that, but actually praise, petition and intercession should be regarded as one and the same spiritual activity, as a single form of meditation. Make this meditation on getting up of a morning, while your mind is still fresh, and, to begin with, mentally adore ultimate reality. Tell yourself that the creation is good and that you are glad and lucky to be alive. Then, veridically personifying, draw into yourself the love, wisdom, power and health of the Truth. Resolve that today you will consciously manifest those qualities in thought, word and deed and next, practically interceding, send forth the same qualities to all living things, whether such be on this planet or elsewhere, then to your relations, then to your family. Spend at least a quarter of an hour doing this.

Further, in addition to having regular, set periods of introspection, you should think of ultimate reality as frequently as possible day and night, an enterprise which, if you properly train yourself to do it, you can pursue even in noisy factory, crowded bus or busy street. Whenever you have a free moment, repeat such an ejaculation, such a *mantra*, as 'May all be happy; may all be free from disease, may all see what is good, may there be sorrow for none.' Or availing yourself of a more Christian wording, say 'Then whose wisdom rightly and sweetly

ordereth all things, pour forth thy love', or 'Thou whose beauty shineth through the whole universe, unveil thy glory', the two last taken from the Liberal Catholic liturgy, the first suggested by Swami Anandakrishna, leader of the Vedanta movement of Rethenham, near Bath.

{TO BE CONCLUDED}

-
1. 1 Cor. xiii. 13.
 2. *Marjorie* 12. 12. 29.
 3. *Marjorie* 14. 5. 34.
 4. *Marjorie* 8. 5. 23.
 5. *Young India* 24. 11. 27.
 6. *Young India* 22. 1. 30.
 7. *Young India* 23. 6. 34.
 8. *Young India* 25. 1. 30.
 9. *Arjuna Charitra in Action*, Edn. 1938, ch. 11.
 10. Margaret Bourke-White, *Halfway to Freedom*, p. 123.
 11. *ML* 66. 17. 18.
 12. *Id.* 74. 32.

GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION PUBLICATIONS

- Abdul Ghafler Khan* by D.G. Tendulkar. 550 p. Cloth Rs 60.
An Anthology of Indian Literatures edited by K. Santhanam. 724 p.
Cloth Rs 50.
The Sage in Revolt : A Remembrance by Pran Chopra. 298 p
Cloth Rs 20
Gandhi : 1875-1948. A Detailed Chronology compiled by C. B.
Dalal. 218 p. Cloth Rs 30
Gandhi : Essential Writings edited by V. V. Ramana Murthi. 470 p.
Cloth Rs 25.
Liquor Menace in India by Tek Chand. 251 p. Cloth Rs 20.
Paper Rs 15
Quest for Gandhi edited by G. Ramachandran and T. K. Mahadevan. 458 p. Cloth Rs 18.
Mahatma Gandhi : 100 Years edited by S. Radhakrishnan. 401 p.
Cloth Rs 17.50.
Truth and Nonviolence edited by T. K. Mahadevan. 460 p. Cloth
Rs 15.
Gandhi : His Relevance for Our Times edited by G. Ramachandran
and T. K. Mahadevan. 393 p. Cloth Rs 15.
Sword of Gold by Roy Walker. 225 p. Cloth Rs 12.50. Paper Rs 7.50
Civilian Defence edited by T. K. Mahadevan, Adam Roberts and
Gene Sharp. 285 p. Cloth Rs 12.
Saga of Satyagraha by R. R. Dwekar. 248 p. Cloth Rs 9. Paper
Rs 5.
Metaphysical Foundation of Mahatma Gandhi's Thought
by Surendra Varma. 177 p. Cloth Rs 8.50. Paper Rs 5.
Gandhian Thought by J. B. Kripalani. 281 p. Cloth Rs 6.50.
Gandhi and Communal Unity by S. Abid Hussain. 151 p
Paper Rs 4.75.
Great Soul by Harryman Maurer. 104 p. Paper Rs 3.75.
Talking of Gandhi by Francis Watson. 141 p. Paper Rs 3.50
Freedom from Fear by Jawaharlal Nehru. 74 p. Paper Rs. 1.
Whither India? 102 p. Paper Rs. 1.
Nonviolence after Gandhi. 93 p. Paper Rs. 1.
I Want a Job or What Can I Do? by Richard B. Gregg. 39 p.
Paper 50 Paise.

Available at
GANDHI BOOK HOUSE
Rajghat, New Delhi-1 (Tel. 373519)

*Enjoy during the Summer Vacation
the beauty and coolness of the
KULU Valley at*

SAPUTARA

(The Sylvan Beauty of Gujarat)

Saputara, the New Hill Resort in Gujarat, is situated on the second highest plateau on the Sahyadri range running through Gujarat State in midst of green and dense forest of Dangs. The hill resort is above mean sea level. Its maximum temperature in summer is 26.7°C and, therefore, its climate is cool and bracing. It is easily accessible all the year round as it has been linked up by all weather asphalt roads having link on one hand with Bilimora on Western Railway via Waghal and Ahwa and on the other with Nasik.

Regular S.T. buses are also plying from Ahwa and Bilimora. Holiday Homes, Dormitories and Rest House are available for occupation at reasonable rates.

For detailed information please write to

Commissioner of Tourism,
Government of Gujarat,
Sachwalepa,
Block No. 2,
Gandhinagar,
(Ahmedabad)
Tel. 2439

Tourist Officer,
Air Lines Building,
Near Rajapalce Cinema,
Lal Darwaja, Ahmedabad-1,
Tel. 24726

Asstt. Director of Information
Saputara Hill Resort,
Saputara, Dangs Dist. Ahwa.

GANDHI MARG

INDEX OF AUTHOR, TITLE AND SUBJECT-IN-TITLE

1973

- Abdullah, Sheikh 7
Anand, Moh. K. 9
History of Gandhi's Nonviolence, the 84
Apostle's Creed 159
Appadurai, A. 11
Approach to nonviolence education 141
Bahuguna, K. P. 325
Balasubramanian, V. 34
Beyond democracy and socialism 162
Bhattacharya, Buddhadev 385
Bibliography, a 251
Byles, Marc B. 167
Chaudhri, Indir 156
Chen, Babubhai M. 17
Crowing dilemma, the 1
Das, Amritananda 190
Dasgupta, D. N. 191
Dasgupta, Sugata 262
Democracy, socialism and Gandhi 184
Doddai 264
Dasgupta, R. R. 34, 369
Durgadas 19, 272
Edwards, I. 107, 179, 343
Education for liberation 323
Equilibrium state, the 211
Experiment in trusteeship management 311
Fernandes, Archbishop 24
Franklin, Roger 126
Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed 159-179
Gandhi and the directive principles of state policy
Gandhi's perception of social change in India after independence, a 304
Gandhi, democracy, socialism and 184
Gandley, martyrdom of 136
Gandhi's tagline 34
Gandhi's thought 150
Gupta, Devendra Kumar 27
Hyslop, Thomas 196, 329
Hick, Ivan 296
Imperatives of education for liberation 325
July 1971: some crucial questions & India since independence 304
Is your journey necessary? 126
Joshi, I. 173
John, V. V. 193
Knowledge, from to 110
Kopale, J. B. 195
Kotzer, Herbert M. 38
Liberation, education for 323
From to knowledge 110
Long live Rajya 1

Looking into the future: 1939-1970
151

Machwe, Prabhakar 213

Mahatma's martyrdom, the 133

Mahish, Harekrishna 31

Mayurda, R.C. 197, 274

Mahotra, S.I. 199

Malkani, K.R. 33, 199

Mankar, D.R. 36, 277

Martyrdom, the Mahatma's 133

Martyrdom of Gandhi 133

Mendonsa, Dennis L. 217

*Meditations on Gandhi and the
Apostle's Creed* 156, 321

Melroze, Cecilia 138

Military as a target of protest, the
38

Mishra, S.N. 300

Mody, Poo 266

Mukerjee, Himu 202

Namboodiripad, E.M.S. 284

Narayan, Shrinani 38, 208

Narla, V.R. 308

Nonviolent revolution 141

Oswy, Bob 141

Paid, R.K. 289

*Peace research: the radical out-
rage* 226

*Peace celebration of the Mahat-
ma's martyrdom, a* 133

*Politics of service versus politics
of power* 179

Power, politics of 179

Protest 38

Radhakrishna 41

Ranga, N.G. 208

Rangachari, K. 283

Rao, P. Kodanda 217

Rao, John R. 113

Rattan, Ram 34

Revolution, nonviolent 141

Ruthaswamy, M. 44

Satyagraha 34

School: the sacred cow 296

Sen, Mohit 290

Service, politics of 179

Shah, A.B. 219

Shah, Manabhai 46

Shukla, S. 49

Social change 304

Socialism 184

*Some characteristics of Gandhi's
thought* 190

Subrahmanyam, K. 33

Subramaniam, C. 34

Subramanyam, Ka Naa 213

Symposium 6, 184, 261

Thapar, Romesh 214

Tropic of silence, the 167

Trust society, the 113

Towards a counter-civilisation 283

Tripathi, S.D. 311

Trustship management 311

Tyabji, Badrud-din 292

Umaitha, T.K.N. 304

Wallace, Michael D. 226

What is the most worthwhile work?
167

Yet lingering curse, the 257

IN BACK NUMBERS

1963

January

- William R. Miller : Gandhi and
Rusg—Pioneers of Modern
Nonviolence
T.K. Mahadevan : An Approach to
the Study of Gandhi
S. Varma : The Four Noble Truths
of Gandhi's Social Philosophy

April

- A Controversy : The Meaning of
Gandhi
Robert Payne : The Inheritance of
Gandhi
Itzhak De Sole Pool : Violence in
Villages
Stuart Nelson : Caste and Un-
touchability—and Gandhi

July

- R.R. Diwekar : The Lokamanya and
the Mahatma
Bhabani Bhattacharya : Some Re-
fections on Gandhi the Writer
Ema Wynne-Tyson : Gandhi and
the God-Idea
S. M. Thearl : Four Questions on
Gandhi's Philosophy

October

- Jayaprakash Narayan : Gandhi and
Social Revolution
A.S. Deshpande : Gandhian Social
Philosophy
Resolving Scheme : The Obligations
of the Individual
B. Lytle : Gandhi's Personality as
a Source of his Influence

1970

January

- Donald H. Bishop : Gandhism and
Discent in America
George Luky : Strategy for Non-
Violent Revolution
James E. Bristol : The Draft Re-
sist Movement in the United
States
Johanna Bosch : Erkkosa's Gandhi

April

- T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Adulthood
of Mahatma Gandhi
K. G. Sulydain : Gandhi's Loveable
Personality
P. Nagareja Rao : The Gandhian
Concept of Dharma
Lyn Bowman : Tolstarianism or
Nonviolence?

July

- Paul F. Power : Gandhi's View of
Citizenship
K. Santhanam : Gandhi's Way of
Life
R. R. Diwekar : Dynamics of
Ahimsa
Gene Sharp : Gandhi as a National
Defence Strategist

October

- Grant Code : The Gums : 1914-1968
James D. Hunt : Thoreau and
Gandhi : A Re-revelation of
the Legacy
T. K. Mahadevan : Gandhi Study in
the Seventies
T. K. N. Unnikrishnan : Gandhian View
of a World Social Order

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

1971

January

William L. Richter : Gandhi and Language : Political Relevance for the Seventies

Stuart Nelson : Nonviolence and India's Independence

Ija Laczari-Pawlowska : Principles of Gandhi's Public Activity

April

James W. Douglass : The Revolution is the Kingdom

James Warren Gould : The Alternative to War

N. G. S. Kani : Techniques and Tools of Gandhian Revolution

K. Gupteewar : Gandhi's Views on Law and Justice

July

Gerald Hurwitz : The Idea of a Mass Deontic Movement

Johan Galtung : Peace Research

C. N. Patel : Erikson's Gandhi

V. V. Ramana Murti : Gandhi and Nehru : Dialogue to Debate

October

Kanak Khanna : Individualistic Trends in Gandhian Thought

Edwin King : Lohia and the U. S. Civil Rights Movement

Charles C. Walker : Nonviolent Action and the U. S. Navy

Ramakrishnareo Vatsy : Gandhi and Technical Education

1972

January

G. Tucci : A Meditation on Donald H. Bishop : The Principles of Nonviolence

Manoranjan Jha : Gandhi, Disobedience and Officials

R.S. Mookhaadiker : The Tradition of Resistance in Ancient India

April

Symposium : India After Dash

Homer A. Jack : The Indian Crisis at the U.N.

W. L. Gargas Jr. : Thoughts on the Road to Stockholm

Marie B. Byles : Needful Balance Between Violence and Nonviolence

July

Lewis Mumford : The Pentagon's Power

James Warren Gould : The Role of Nonviolence in Social Change

R. R. Diwakar : Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy : Its Universal Dimensions

James W. Douglass : The Yang of Resistance and the Yin of Accommodation

October

Maurice Friedman : The Limits of Otherness and the Quest for Peace

James E. Brissett : Nonviolence First for Export

James J. Preston : Religious and Political Processes in Gandhi's Thought

GANDHI MARG
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION
NEW DELHI

Gandhi Marg

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF GANDHIAN THOUGHT

*There is no such thing as Gandhiism
and I do not want to leave any sect after me.*

VOLUME THREE NUMBER ONE JANUARY 1989

GANDHI SMARAK NIDHI

Former Chairmen

Dr. Rajendra Prasad
Shri G. V. Mavalankar
Shri B. G. Kher

Present Board of Trustees

<i>Chairman</i>	Shri Ghanshyamdas Birla
Shri R. R. Diwaker	.. Kasturbbai Lalbhai
	Lala Shri Ram
<i>Vice-Chairman</i>	Mr A. P. Bhatnair
Smt. Sucheta Kripalani	Dr. Gopichand Bhargava
	Smt. Yashodhara Desappa
<i>Members</i>	.. Acharya Aryanapalkam
Shri Jawaharlal Nehru	Dr. Prafulla Chandra Ghosh
.. C. Rajagopalachari	.. Zakir Husain
.. Govind Ballabh Pant	Shri U. N. Dhebar
Shri Jagjivan Ram	.. Dharendra Mazumdar
Rajkumar Amrit Kaur	.. Vankarsh L. Mehta
Acharya J. B. Kripalani	.. Morarji Desai
Shri Jhangan R. D. Tata	.. Kamal Nayyar Bajaj
	Smt. Laxmi Behn Gandhi

Executive Committee

<i>Chairman</i>	Acharya J. B. Kripalani
Shri R. R. Diwaker	Smt. Laxmi Behn Gandhi
	Rajkumar Amrit Kaur
<i>Vice-Chairman</i>	Smt. Yashodhara Desappa
Smt. Sucheta Kripalani	Shri U. N. Dhebar
	Shri Morarji Desai
<i>Members</i>	
Shri Jawaharlal Nehru	<i>Secretary</i>
Lala Shri Ram	Shri G. Ramachandran

Holding Trustees

Shri G. D. Birla *Chairman*
Shri Kasturbbai Lalbhai *Vice-Chairman*
Shri J. B. D. Tata
Lala Shri Ram
Smt. Sucheta Kripalani
Shri Morarji Desai

General Office - Gandhi Smarak Nidhi, Rajghat, New Delhi-1.

Gandhi Marg

Editor

G. RAMACHANDRAN

VOLUME THREE

NUMBER ONE

JANUARY 1989

GANDHI SMARAK NIDHI

RAJGHAT NEW DELHI

EDITORIAL BOARD

R. R. DIWAKAR

J. B. KRIPALANI

JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM

SHRIMAN NARAYAN

SADIQ ALI

G. RAMACHANDRAN

PUBLISHER

T. K. MAHADEVAN

Rs 1.00 a year in South Asia, 50s. or \$1.00 elsewhere, postage

Rs 1.50 (5s. or 75s.) the copy. Payment in advance

*Published by T. K. Mahadevan for the Gandhi Smarak Niket, Angkor, New Delhi, and
printed by them at the Narayan Press Private Limited (Lovers of Art & Press) Delhi*

Contents

Editorial Notes 3

M. Yamasacharya	Gandhi on the Individual and Society 4
Vinoba Bhave	The Steadfast Wisdom 11
George Hendrick	Gandhi and Dr Martin Luther King 18
Wilfred Wollack	In Search of New Horizons 23
Harris Wofford, Jr	Non-Violence and the Law 27
	Three Early Letters from Gandhi to Gokhale 36
P.C. Gupta	Impact of Gandhi on Hindi Literature 40
B. Nataraja	Gandhian Memories of Forty Years Ago 50
Omoo Kumar Das	Impact of Gandhi on Assamese Literature 56
G. Hendrick	Review Article : Dr King's Pilgrimage to Non-Violence 63
Ethel Mannin	Letter to the Editor : Dr Schweitzer and Respect for Life 68
G. Ramachandran	Re-organization and Improvement of <i>Tatva-Prachin</i> , 69

Contributors to this Number

Vinod Bhave : *is* the second of his discourses on the *Shriyasa Gita*, ably translated for us from the original Hindi by Lila Ray and Aloka Bhattacharya. The first of the translations appeared in *Gandhi Marg*, October 1958.

Omoo Kumar Das : a veteran journalist and political leader of Assam, editor of *Assamya* and author of several works on Gandhi in Assamese.

P.C. Gupta : assistant professor of English literature in the University of Allahabad, author of several critical works on Hindi literature and a novel.

George Headock : teaches English in the University of Colorado; his doctoral thesis was on 'Indian Imprints upon Thoreau and Thoreau's Influence on Gandhi'; has written before in *Gandhi Marg*.

Ethel Mann, the well-known

English novelist, is a frequent contributor to *Gandhi Marg*.

B. Natesan : was for long associated with *Indian Renew*, Madras; has written before in *Gandhi Marg*.

Wilfred Wellock : well known English Pacifist and a keen protagonist of the way of Gandhi; writes frequently in *Gandhi Marg*.

Haris Wofford, Jr : a new contributor to *Gandhi Marg*, introduced by Sri G.L. Mehta, former Indian Ambassador in the United States; his article is an adaptation of a paper read at the forty-first annual convocation of the Howard University School of Religion.

M. Yamaschbarya : retired professor of philosophy, University of Mysore, now Chief Editor of the *Works of Gandhi in Kannada*; his contributions from Gandhi will continue to be published in *Gandhi Marg* from time to time.

Editorial Notes

At the last meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Gandhi National Memorial Fund, held on 15 February 1958, the Chairman was authorised to take the necessary steps to establish the Gandhi Peace Foundation. Accordingly, in April 1958, the Chairman set up a Pilot Committee to go into the question and to give thought to the matter. The Pilot Committee consisted of the following persons: Śrī. R. R. Duttikar, chairman; Dr S. Raghākrishnan, Śrī. Jawāharlāl Nehrū, Śrī. Morarji Deasī, Āchārya J. B. Kripplān, Śrī U. N. Dhebar and Śrīmatī Suchetā Kripplān, members; and Śrī. G. Rāmāchāndran, secretary.

The Pilot Committee met three times, on 6 May, 9 July and 19 December 1958. At the second meeting, it recommended to the Executive Committee of the Fund to set apart Rs 10 million for the Gandhi Peace Foundation. The Executive Committee resolved to do so at its meeting on 10 July 1958.

At the last meeting of the Pilot Committee, Dr S. Raghākrishnan was requested to finalise a statement putting together the Preamble, the Objectives and the Explanatory Note prepared by Śrī Jawāharlāl Nehrū, by himself and by Āchārya Kripplān respectively.

The statement follows.

The Gandhi Peace Foundation

In his unique and inspiring leadership of the struggle for freedom in India, Mahātmā Gāndhī showed the way for a new life based on the values of satya (truth) and ahimsā (non-violence), with the reasonable corollary that good ends can be achieved only through good means, both in individual and group life. He applied these methods to the national struggle involving millions of people and thereby helped them to achieve freedom without hatred or armed conflict. The peaceful struggle ended in a settlement which achieved the objective aimed at and yet left no trail of bitterness behind. Although Gāndhī applied these methods in India

be held that they were applicable everywhere for the solution of any kind of conflict, social, national or international. Though Gandhi's teaching and example have so far touched the mind and life of only a few, there is the faith that in course of time they will affect the thoughts and actions of millions throughout the world and usher in a new way of life for mankind.

The Gandhi Peace Foundation is being formed for the furtherance of this objective and to promote the acceptance by all peoples of the principles of truth and non-violence in the conduct of social, national and international affairs.

In order to achieve this objective, the functions of the Foundation will be: (i) to establish an international centre of study and research in the principles of non-violence as evident from the study of the history and philosophy of India and of the world; (ii) to study and report in cooperation with other agencies, where necessary, techniques for the application of non-violence in social, national and international affairs; (iii) to provide information, counsel and assistance in this field to teaching institutions in the form of research fellowships, travel grants, library equipment and act as a coordinating authority; (iv) to assist in developing an informed public opinion on the principles and techniques of non-violence among all peoples; and (v) generally to take all necessary action to attain the objectives of the Foundation.

A revolution is primarily and fundamentally a change in the basic values of life. On the basis of the new values is built a new culture, a new way of life and a new phase of human civilisation. A revolution may be instigated by a great personality or arise from a sudden outburst of the repressed forces of progress or its course may be comparatively gradual, even when its nature is radical, as in the case of the Industrial Revolution. It may emerge from religious, political, economic or social causes. Whatever be the originating impulse, if it succeeds, it leads to affect the whole of life, individual and collective.

It must not however be supposed that the ideas that give birth to a revolution spring to life all of a sudden. When analysed, the causes are found to have been at work prior to the efforts of the instigating genius or the sudden outburst. Further, no revolution is complete with the passing away of the person who gave it the first impulse or the outburst that heralded it. That is only the beginning. The work of the revolution is continued, extended and consolidated by generations of people who have faith in the new values and in the new way of life. But every revolution has its own rhythm and when fairly complete creates its own system of social arrangements.

Those responsible for conceiving the idea of the Gandhi Peace Foundation believe that Gandhi initiated a revolution in the life of humanity based on truth, non-violence and a strict regard for the means used to achieve worthwhile ends.

Gandhi's ideas would not be exhausted or even fully explained by merely an analysis and evaluation of the possibilities of non-violence in national and international political life. The revolution that he initiated goes much farther and deeper and manifests itself in every important aspect of life creating a new individual in a new society. It has, therefore, like other revolutions, as already stated, its own rhythm and concept of a new society.

Gandhi, not being a philosopher in the ordinary sense of the term or a theoretician, did not care to systematise his thought; much less did he formulate a rigid social system. He was first and foremost a man of action. Explanation came afterwards and it then brought out the basic ideas and principles underlying action. Yet there can be little doubt that he brought his practical revolutionary ideas to bear upon every sphere of life and there is an underlying unity binding them. It may truly be said of him that he strove to purify the life of India from its latrines to its soul. Though his field of activity after the general years in South Africa was confined to India, his ideas and his methods of action have a universal application.

It should be the task of the Gandhi Peace Foundation to systematise these ideas and methods of work and unfold their rhythm by a careful study of Gandhi's life, and the large volume of writings that he produced and the speeches he delivered in English, Hindi and Gujarati. It should also be an effort to understand the significance of the changing techniques he employed to bring about desirable ends, in consonance with his basic moral principles. Further, a comprehensive study of Gandhi's life and thought must include an examination of the practical schemes of constructive work that were organised and sponsored by him and also similar schemes devised after him but which derive their light and inspiration from his life and teachings. There is also the important task of studying the historical background in India and elsewhere of his thought and pattern of action.

Since a revolution is invariably preceded by a general ferment in society, the student must also study the stir in Indian society during the nineteenth century, before Gandhi appeared on the field of Indian public life. This upsurge of the Indian spirit was part of the Indian renaissance

and even while Gandhi represented an olden he was at the same time the initiator of a new epoch in our history.

The Foundation should study the working of the institutions engaged in constructive work on the lines indicated by Gandhi. This will bring a deeper insight into Gandhi's ideas and actions and the possibility of their practical application to the solution of the problems facing the confused world of today, where old values and standards are crumbling, creating a moral vacuum, which is largely filled by the pursuit of success and power and the satisfaction of the senses.

When it is said that Gandhi's ideas need to be elucidated and systematized, it is not meant that they should be put into a rigid or inflexible system. In fact they would not lend themselves to such treatment. Nor is there any question of uncritical acceptance of everything. There should be free scope for the expression of differences of opinion, arising from sincere conviction, moral or intellectual.

It is such a plan of comprehensive study and research as outlined above that should be placed before all those who would work in the Gandhi Peace Foundation. This will be its *raison d'être*.

Reginald Reynolds

Readers of *Gandhi Marg*, as indeed all followers of Gandhian thought throughout the world, will wish to share with us our sorrow on the passing away of Reginald Reynolds. He died of a cerebral haemorrhage in the third week of December 1955, while on a visit to Australia at the invitation of the Society of Friends. Before leaving for Australia he wrote to us (the last we heard from him). 'Seems no hope of re-visiting India on this trip. To save money I've had to book on the cheapest line—which doesn't stop between Aden and Fremantle.'

Reynolds was a passionate fighter for Indian independence, and as a young man suddenly became well known as the bearer of Gandhi's famous letter to Lord Irwin, the Viceroy of India, announcing the start of the Gandhi salt satyagraha in 1930. Not only did the Quaker become one of Bapu's leading English disciples, but he even became a familiar figure at Sevagram, where his love of children prompted him to collect the local lads and lead them round the village shouting, *Mahatma Gandhi ki Jay*. In spite of dangerously ill health, he went on a mission to Japan in 1937 and volunteered to be a member of the group which wished to go to the

Pacific to protest against British atomic tests there.¹

Novelist Ethel Mannen, his wife, wrote to us soon after his death : 'I thought he might make the scores . . . and he might have done so had he not worn himself out moving about the world on these great tours, preaching peace and better race relations and the liberation of subject peoples. He called his book about Gandhi "To Live in Mankind", you may remember, but he himself lived as mankind no less.'

Dr Martin Luther King

Our readers will see in this issue two articles and a review concerning Dr Martin Luther King and his work. Have we not in India watched with sympathy and admiration the non-violent struggles of the Negroes in America to achieve their full equality, in law and in spirit, with all others who constitute the citizenship of the United States and the valiant and personal leadership which Dr King has given to some of them? We are glad to announce that the Gandhi National Memorial Fund has sent a cordial invitation to Dr and Mrs King to visit India early and to spend three to four weeks in the country. We have asked them to share with the Indian people their experiences and thoughts and at the same time study at first hand how Mahatma Gandhi evolved the technique of peaceful action to solve innumerable social and national problems in India. We expect he would be particularly interested to know how Gandhi wrestled with the problem of untouchability and succeeded in showing the way out non-violently against the heaviest odds.

Dr King and Mrs King are expected to arrive in India on 4 February this year and to stay in the country till 9 March. The Kings are sure to be warmly received by our people and leaders everywhere and their visit might lead to the opening of another radiant chapter in the history of non-violent action to achieve justice peacefully in the world.

¹ Portions of this paragraph have been adapted from the *New Statesman* and the *Times of India*.

Gandhi on the Individual and Society

Selections from his writings

M. YAMUNACHARYA

The individual is the one supreme consideration. If the individual ceases to count, what is left of society? Individual freedom alone can make a man voluntarily surrender himself completely to the service of society. If it is wrested from him, he becomes an automaton and society is ruined. No society can possibly be built on a denial of individual freedom. It is contrary to the very nature of man. Just as a man will not grow horns or a tad, so he will not exist as man if he has no mind of his own. In reality even those who do not believe in liberty of the individual believe in their own.

All the sages have declared from the house-tops that man can be his own worst enemy as well as his best friend. To be free or to be a slave lies in his own hands. And what is true for the individual is true for society.

The individual is the architect of his own government. I look upon an increase of the power of the state with the greatest fear, because although apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress.

The end to be sought is human happiness combined with full mental and moral growth. I use the adjective moral as synonymous with spiritual. This end can be achieved under decentralisation. Centralisation as a system is inconsistent with the non-violent structure of society. In this structure composed of innumerable villages life will

not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units. The outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle but will give strength to all within and derive its own strength from it. If there ever is to be a republic of every village in India then I claim verily for my picture, in which the last is equal to the first or, in other words, no-one is to be the last and none the last.

Individual freedom can have the fullest play only under a regime of unadulterated ahimsa. True democracy or the sway of the masses can never come through untruthful and violent means, for the simple reason that the natural corollary to their use would be to remove all opposition through the suppression or extermination of the antagonists. That does not make for individual freedom.

Consciously or unconsciously, we are acting non-violently towards one another in daily life. All well-constructed societies are based on the Law of Non-violence. Scientists tell us that without the presence of the cohesive force amongst the atoms that comprise this globe of ours, it would crumble to pieces and we cease to exist. And even as there is a cohesive force in blind matter, so must there be in all things animate; and the same for that cohesive force among animate things is Love. We notice it between father and son, between brother and sister, friend and friend. But we have to learn to use that force among all that lives and in the use of it consists our knowledge of God. Where there is love, there is life; hatred leads to destruction.

It has become the fashion these days to say that society cannot be organized or run on non-violent lines. I gain issue on that point. In a family, when a father slaps his delinquent child, the latter does not think of retaliating. He obeys his father not because of the deterrent effect of the slap, but because of the offended love which he senses behind it. That, in my of opinion, is an epitome of the way in which society is or should be governed. What is true of the family must be true of society, which is but a larger family. It is man's imagination that divides the world into warring groups of enemies and friends. In the ultimate resort it is the power of love that acts even in the midst of the clash and sustains the world.

This society must naturally be based on truth and non-violence,

which, in my opinion, are not possible without a living force which abides in every other force known to the world, and which depends on none, and which will live when all other forces may conceivably perish or cease to act. I am unable to account for my life without belief in this all-embracing light.

It will be a sad thing if India also tries to build up the new society based on cooperation by means of violence. Good brought about through force destroys individuality. Only when the change is effected through the persuasive power of non-violent non-cooperation, that is love, can the foundation of individuality be preserved and real, abiding progress be assured for the world.

I would feel that if we succeed in building the character of the individual, society will take care of itself. I would be quite willing to trust the organization of society to individuals so developed.

I value individual freedom, but one must not forget that man is essentially a social being. He has risen to his present status by learning to adjust his individualism to the requirements of social progress. Unrestricted individualism is the law of the beast, of the jungle. We have learnt to strike the mean between individual freedom and social restraint. Willing subordination to social restraint, for the sake of the well being of the whole society, enriches both the individual and the society of which one is a member.

My work will be finished if I succeed in carrying conviction to the human family that every man or woman, however weak in body, is the guardian of his or her self-respect and liberty.¹

1. All the excerpts in this selection are reproduced with the permission of the Navajivan Trust.

The Steadfast Wisdom

VINODA BHAVE¹

We have considered² Arjuna's question. And we have also tried to determine what *prajña*, wisdom, is and *samādhi*. Wisdom does not mean common sense. On the contrary, it is the intelligence which tends to analyse. This wisdom must be fixed, upright. This means it must be straight, sure. We have also seen that *samādhi* here does not mean the *samādhi* of meditation, *dhyana-samādhi*. We find it necessary here to study the word *samādhi* a little further. It is composed of three parts, *sam*, *a*, and the suffix *dhi* as a root. The word *samādhiya*, which means solution, fixity, has the same derivation. When one's consciousness has attained a state of fixity, found a solution, it has achieved *samādhi*. The word *samādhiya* is also used to describe a balance, equality of weight. When the weights in a balance are equal, they are steady, in equilibrium, and said to be *samastā*, balanced. The scales are steady, equally weighted. If the consciousness attains a state as steady, as quiet, as evenly balanced as a pair of scales, we know that it has attained a state of *samādhiya*, equilibrium. It has reached a solution. This equilibrium is a continuous condition ; it cannot be upset. Later, in the sixth chapter, this state is compared to a lamp burning in a vacuum. This is called the *stambha* of the lamp, and is to be explained as a condition in which the flame of the lamp is unmoving, quiet, without a flicker. It should not be taken to mean the extinguishing of the lamp. The peace that comes with its extinguishing cannot be attained as long as we inhabit the body. *Samādhi* means a tranquility of consciousness, a peace of mind, which can be experienced in the body, in life, and which once achieved does not falter. This is the way in which Arjuna's question has been answered by the word *samādhi*, and this is what Kṛpā explains

1 Translated from the original Hindi by Lila Rily and Adoka Bhattacharya.

2 See *Godhā Māyā*, October 1955.

in the following verse:

*Pragbhati yadi kareṇa vareda Pārtha manogata,
Ananyatāraṇaṁ tasya śāntaprajñāḥ udayasat.*

'Arjuna, when a yogi forgets all the desires of his heart and grows calm, content within himself, he is called one of Steadfast Wisdom.'

Here *śānta* is given its *śānta* sense. The pivot of this interpretation is the word *anyatāraṇa*. It is accurate and total. That is to say, it has two aspects, the negative and the positive. This duality completes it, for only an exposition which takes both into consideration can be complete. Take, for instance, the word *ahimsā*. In its negative sense it means that violence should not be used. In its positive, affirmative, sense it means that love should be our method. Taken together these two senses complete the single meaning of the word *ahimsā*. Similarly the phrase 'when he forgets all desires' is the negative aspect of *śānta* and 'becomes content within himself' is the positive aspect. These two, taken together, define the state of being called *śānta* in a subtle and certain way.

The foregoing of all desire is here given as a prohibition, a forbiddenness, a negation, a denial. The heart is composed of desires of various kinds. The meaning therefore is: 'May I not have such a heart'. One day a certain astrologer looked at the palm of my hand. 'There is no heart line here', he said. 'If that is so', I answered, 'then I have found God'. In my opinion a man has need only of intelligence, *buddhi*. It is better not to have a heart of the kind described. The heart must be subordinated into the mind. Uncertainty alternates with certainty in an unstable flux with the heart. Certainty is sometimes uppermost and sometimes uncertainty. The heart is a bundle of needs, desires. Certainty and uncertainty—our needs—should be ordered and controlled by the inspiration of the intelligence. There should be no disagreement between the head and the heart. There should be no conflict, no straining apart, one from the other. The mind should speak and the heart obey. The mind's work is to analyse. The mind is the legislator; it makes the rules. The work of the heart is to put the rules into practice, to enforce the laws, to act as the executive. The heart ought not to usurp the powers of the mind, nor encroach upon its jurisdiction. Let each do its own work. Does the tongue do more than decide whether a piece of candy is really sweet or whether it is bitter, whether it is edible or inedible? It is not the tongue's function to decide how many pieces of candy may be eaten. It should not dare to concern itself with that problem. The heart should

follow the guidance of the mind. By degrees it should immerse itself entirely in the mind. Desires are like wrappings around the heart. Remove them one by one and the bundle will disappear entirely. Thus it becomes possible to say that the heart has merged with the mind, lost itself, become one with the mind, in form, in feeling and in being. This is the real destruction of the heart. To destroy the heart means to destroy the power of the heart. It means that the heart identifies itself with, and follows the guidance of the mind without any protest. To give effect to analysis there is no need to destroy the power of the heart to obey. This power must be kept intact. But desire must be rooted out. The foregoing of all desire in this complete fashion constitutes the negative aspect of the interpretation of the Steadfast Wisdom.

Now let us consider its affirmative aspect, the self-contentment of inner commitment. This is the mark of acceptance. The Steadfast Wisdom is content. The inner vision gives it more satisfaction than any outward show. And in truth, what we behold with our inner eye is more pleasing and more beautiful to the sight than anything we behold externally. A poet's description of what he sees is very much more delightful than the actual thing he describes. The ideal inner world of the poet is more delightful than the actual external reality. The ideal character of the inner vision is clearly shown in the signs which are recognised as indicating the acceptance of the Steadfast Wisdom. This wisdom is revealed in its entirety if the two characteristics given herein are present. One who has achieved this wisdom forgets all desire and the spring of contentment rises within him. No happiness is to be found in the bundle of desires. He must realise this from the outset. Surely it is worth our while to consider whether any real pleasure or permanence is to be found in desire, is it not? Experience does not show that either peace, stability or refreshing contact is to be found in desire. On the contrary desires unsettle the heart and make it restless. The restlessness fills us with anxiety, sets fire alight. There is no reason to fear that we shall lose the refreshment of coolness with the passing of desire. Any stability that desire may appear to have is not more than a semblance of true stability. The satisfaction of a desire does bring happiness because, to put it in another way, the desire is eliminated. To fulfil a desire is one way of getting rid of it. A little thought will show that happiness is found, not in the desire itself, but in freedom from it. It is for this reason that we say that the two signs of the Steadfast Wisdom are (i) the complete foregoing of desire and (ii) self-contained contentment.

These two signs are not merely the affirmative and negative aspects of the Steadfast Wisdom. They convey other meanings also. One is the

primary and the other the secondary aspect of reality. To forgo all desire is the disciplinary aspect of the Straight Wisdom. The second stage, inner contentment, results from this primary discipline. The first is preliminary and the second the sequel, the product of the discipline.

Bhāya-sparśaṃ saakṛtvāṃ vadatyātmā jātavekam

"When one's consciousness is set free from outward things it becomes possible to understand what happens there is within"—the *Gītā* describes this state in these words. Elsewhere it says that as the inner vision grows the waves of desire dry up proportionately. This means that *disaśāraṇa*, the cultivation of the inner vision, constancy, is the spiritual discipline which brings about the destruction of desire. Self-contentment therefore appears to be the most fundamental quality. Contentment of spirit is not visible to the eye. What can be seen is the forgoing of desire. For a person not to have any desires is the outward sign of inner contentment. We may therefore call it the fruit of contentment. To argue about which of these two indications appears first is meaningless. The loss of desire and the inner vision are both the cause and result of each other.

We have spoken of the uprooting of desire, referring to them as though they are so many thorny weeds. A thorn pricks even though it is made of gold. And a knife can kill, even though it be a golden knife. And so the *Gītā* concludes that, one and all desires must be eliminated without exception. The *Gītā* is, however, cited as raising no objection to the retention of a certain type of desire. The following line is produced as proof—

Dharmadharmaḥa bhāvaḥ kṛmāni, Bhāratayabha

Let us therefore consider the matter carefully. There is actually nothing contradictory in these two statements. One indicates the state of stability to which we are to aspire. The second indicates the manner in which desires are to be removed. Four methods are commonly used. They are: (i) *vyāpaka-prakṛyā* or diffusion; (ii) *śāṅga-prakṛyā* or concentration; (iii) *śāṅga-prakṛyā* or refinement, and (iv) *śāṅga-prakṛyā* or purification.

Diffusion

Desires are personal, individual. A desire is given a general, a social, application in order to destroy it. This is the way of *karma yoga*. Suppose, for instance, a gentleman living in a certain village wishes to educate his son. He can found a school in the village. He can,

is arranging for the education of his son, arrange to educate other boys in the village also. His desire is thus given a social character. Let me give an example out of the past. When a person felt a desire to eat meat he was directed to hold a *yajña*. In a *yajña*, the person who holds it may eat what remains when everyone else has been given his fill. Women follow the same practice in their homes. Housewives eat what is left after everybody else has been fed. Little but the labour often fails to their lot. But their personal desire is, in this way, enlarged to include the welfare of the whole family. It is dissipated through the *karma* of duty. By this method desire is progressively enlarged, its scope made more and more inclusive and in the process of expansion it is turned out to nullify.

Copyright © 2004 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Compare the desires in your heart and determine which of them is the strongest. Then concentrate upon it, letting all the others go. Nothing else should occupy your mind. Suppose, for instance, that among a scholar's many desires is the desire to study the *Yoda*. He finds that this is stronger than the others. He will then go to live at the house of his guru and study, nourishing himself with whatever food his guru may give him. He may, as a result, lose all taste for a certain type of food, say, sweets. The recognition and acceptance of a single desire as a fixed resolve and the organization of one's entire life around it, is the method used by *Shyama yoga*. All students in whom the desire for knowledge is keen, make use of it. They subordinate all other desires to the desire to learn and undergo a great deal of hardship in order to fulfil it.

multidirectional data related data multidirectional network

"Where will those who crave happiness find knowledge? Where will those who seek knowledge find happiness?" wrote Vyāsa. When we surround that happiness, convenience and knowledge are all simultaneously provided in our students' hostel; we take an attitude diametrically opposed to the *li*. It is a mistaken attitude. If one thinks too much of happiness one cannot put one's mind on one's study. Therefore examine your desires, determine which is the strongest, and concentrate all your energies on its fulfilment. This is what the scientists who conduct modern materialistic experiments do. They give their entire attention to the experiment in hand, eliminating all other considerations. This is called *dhyāna yoga*, the yoga of meditation. Centre your attention upon one desire, a desire chosen because of its strength, and let all other desires go. Last of all you will be able to let go of the central one. For when concentration is completely achieved you will no longer require it either and thus can set yourself free from it.

Refinement

This is the method by which crude and coarse desires are supplanted by progressively finer ones. You may, for instance, love clothes and like to be well dressed. Dress up your inner rather than your outer self. Decorate your mind. Cultivate wit. Seek new knowledge. Learn new arts. This enrichment of the inner self is much less vulgar than the decoration of the body. It is more refined. There is an enrichment, a taste, even more refined still—that of decking the heart with virtues. More fragrant than the perfume which scents the body is the fragrance of a mind animated by a keen intelligence. More fragrant still is the scent of a heart endowed with all the virtues. ‘See how my loving mother has dressed me!’ cries Nāgārjuna at the beginning of one of his poems. A delightful description follows. It is a description of the clothing of the inner self. It is decked out in fancy as a doting mother decks her child in beautiful clothes. Inner adornment adds more to the beauty of life than any outer adornment can. Forge the coarse decoration of the body and turn your attention to the finer adornment of the soul. Happiness lies, not in desire, but in the satisfaction of desire. A coarse desire is difficult to satisfy, for in order to do so outer objects must be obtained. A finer desire is less difficult to satisfy, for all that is required is available within oneself. In this way a desire, turned inward, subtilized and made subjective, can be satisfied and through being satisfied, eliminated. This is the method followed by *jñān* yoga, the way of knowledge.

Purification

In this method no distinction is made between personal, individual desires and social desires or between outer and inner desires, fine or coarse. We differentiate only between desires that are good and desires that are evil. Keep the good and get rid of the bad. But mangoes when you crave candy. Candy may be harmful and the craving of it may also enhance your craving for indulgence. Mangoes are good for health and the act of substituting them for candy may also add to your pleasure in natural goodness. In this method we do not speak of the destruction of desire from the outset. We merely suggest that good desires be substituted for evil ones. Examine your desires and determine for yourself, with the help of your own intelligence, which are good and which bad. Our own opinion is proof enough for us. To determine the nature of some desires the assistance of science can be taken. But with or without the help of science, the person who feels a desire must find out for himself whether it is beneficial to him or not. The mind is gradually purified by the elimination of bad desires through the process of replacing them by good ones. A bad desire is eliminated when a good one is put in its place. The satisfaction of the

good desire does away with it. Eventually therefore no desires at all are left. This is the method of destroying desire by purification.

Of these four methods of eliminating desire the last, the method of purification, is the safest, the surest. Therefore it is the best. This method is followed in *bhakti yoga*, the way of devotion. Though other methods give great strength they also involve danger. In the method of diffusion a desire is expanded from the individual to the community. What if the desire itself be evil? If a person craves drink, he is, according to this method, obliged to open a drinking club for the public. That will bring about not only his own downfall but a social evil. A desire is not purified merely by extension. The same danger is inherent in the method of concentration. Even results if the desire upon which a person concentrates all his energies is an evil desire. The concentration of one's consciousness is the subject of the *yoga śāstra*. Patanjali suggests that before concentration is begun the art of self-control should be practised. Otherwise a calamity may ensue. The *yoga* of meditation can bring disaster instead of liberation. In both socialisation and concentration (concentrations) there is power, strength, great forcefulness. But this power can turn men into devils. Even the method of refinement is not without danger. The refinement of a desire does not necessarily make it pure. The most terrible consequences may result if a desire centres upon another person and is indulged in a disembodied form. Therefore the method of purification which is followed in *bhakti yoga* is the least dangerous. It is for this reason that Tulsidāsa wrote :

Bhagat kṛantira prakāśita na śak.

Bhakti is self-sufficient. It has no need of assistance from anything. *Bhakti*, devotion, is required in order to avoid the dangers associated with all the other three methods, but *bhakti* itself does not require the assistance of any of them. Other methods develop strength, it is true, but they also involve danger. Strength on the one hand and safety on the other. There is a difference between strength and devotion, *bhakti*. *Bhakti* without strength may be weak but it will not be evil or calamitous. Strength without *bhakti* can, on the contrary, invoke calamity. *Bhakti* will never, in any circumstances, work harm. Therefore the method of destroying desire by purification, the method followed in *bhakti yoga*, is from every point of view desirable and safe.

Śāpavedāntādīḥ bhāṣitāḥ kāmavān.

'I am the desire for good which animates all creatures.' These lines make this quite plain.

Gandhi and Dr Martin Luther King

GEORGE HENDRICK

A Gandhian social revolution of epic proportions began, appropriately enough, in a quiet way on 1 December 1955, in Montgomery, Alabama. A city bus loaded with thirty-six passengers stopped in front of the Empire Theatre where six white passengers boarded. Since all seats were occupied, the driver asked the Negroes nearest the front to give their seats to the white passengers. Miss Rosa Parks, a Negro seamstress, refused. 'I don't really know why I wouldn't move', she has said. 'There was no plot or plan at all. I was just tired from shopping. My feet hurt.' Mrs Parks was taken from the bus, arrested, and later fined \$10.

In a study of the barbaric custom of segregation practised in southern United States, *Time*¹ has noted: 'Other Negroes had suffered worse indignities, but here was the one that the South would long remember. The Montgomery City Lines Inc. had long been a special arbitrist to the Negroes, who made up 70 per cent. of its patronage. At best, they had to pay their fares in front, get off and board again in the rear, sometimes after they had dropped their money in the fare box and were going around to the rear, the bus drivers drove off. At worst, the Negroes were cursed, slapped and kicked by the white drivers. By the time of the Parks case, they had had all they could take without some sort of reply.'

Two days after Mrs Parks's arrest, circulars appeared in the Negro section of Montgomery requesting a one-day protest by not riding the buses on the day of Mrs Parks's trial. On 5 December, the day of the trial, at least seventy-five per cent. of the Negro bus riders boycotted the transit system. The Reverend Thomas R. Shriver has referred to this

1. *Time*, 18 February 1957.

initial incident as 'an act of passive resistance on a monumental scale, which could not be passed off as simply a product of outside interference, agitation, or intimidation. There was no widespread absenteeism from work that day; the protesters went to their jobs by Negro taxis, wagons, or by foot over long distances'.

After Mrs Parks was fined \$10 for refusing to conform to the state segregation laws, a mass meeting was held that night at the Holt Street Baptist Church. A resolution was adopted calling on all citizens to boycott the buses until 'some arrangement' had been agreed upon. The proposals for ending the boycott included 'more courteous treatment of Negro passengers; seating on a first-come-first-served basis, with Negroes continuing to sit from the rear of the bus and whites from front to rear; Negro bus drivers to be employed on predominantly Negro runs'. The five thousand Negroes present at the meeting were requested to make their automobiles available to assist in getting others to work; an organization, the Montgomery Improvement Association, was formed to help with the work, and Dr Martin Luther King was named the director.

Although born in the South, Dr King studied in integrated seminaries in the North. While at Crozer Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania, Dr King studied not only Christian theology but also the works of Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau, Locke and Hegel. He also read Gandhi: 'Even now', he has said, 'in reading Gandhi's words again, I am given inspiration. The spirit of passive resistance came to me from the Bible and the teachings of Jesus. The techniques of execution came from Gandhi'.

Dr King's subsequent leadership, considering his philosophic background, should not have baffled even the most bigoted white Southerner. Assessing the non-violent program which was being instituted, he has said: 'Everyone must realize that in the early days of the protest there were many who questioned the effectiveness, and even the morality, of non-violence. But as the protest has continued there has been a growing commitment on the part of the entire Negro population. Those who were willing to get their guns in the beginning are coming to see the futility of such an approach.'

The influence of Gandhian thought is particularly well illustrated in Dr King's article entitled 'Our Struggle': 'The segregation of Negroes,

2. *Reporter*, 8 March 1956.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Time*, loc. cit.

5. *Liberation*, December 1955.

6. *Ibid.*, April 1956.

with its invariable discrimination, has thrived on elements of inferiority present in the masses of both white and Negro people. Through forced separation from our African culture, through slavery, poverty, and deprivation, many black men lost self-respect. In their relations with Negroes, white people discovered that they had rejected the very centre of their own ethical professions. They could not face the triumph of their inner instincts and simultaneously have peace within. And so, to gain it, they rationalized—insisting that the unfortunate Negro, being less than human, deserved and even enjoyed second-class status.

"In time many Negroes lost faith in themselves and came to believe that perhaps they really were what they had been told they were—something less than men. So long as they were prepared to accept this role, racial peace could be maintained. It was an uneasy peace in which the Negro was forced to accept patiently injustice, insult, injury, and exploitation."

Dr King continued: "Although law is an important factor in bringing about social change, there are certain conditions in which the very effort to adhere to new legal decisions creates tension and provokes violence. We had hoped to see demonstrated a method that would enable us to continue our struggle while coping with the violence it aroused. Now we see the answer: *Latin violence if necessary, but refuse to return violence.* If we respect those who oppose us, they may achieve a new understanding of the human relations involved.

"If, in pressing for justice and equality in Montgomery, we discover that those who reject equality are prepared to use violence, we must not despair, retreat, or fear. Before they make this crucial decision, they must remember: whatever they do, we will not use violence in return. We hope we can act in the struggle in such a way that they will see the error of their approach and will come to respect us. Then we can all live together in peace and equality.

"The basic conflict is not really over the buses. Yet we believe that, if the method we use in dealing with equality in the buses can eliminate injustice within ourselves, we shall at the same time be attacking the basis of injustice—man's hostility to man. This can only be done when we challenge the white community to re-examine its assumptions as we are now prepared to re-examine ours.

"We do not wish to triumph over the white community. That would only result in transferring those now at the bottom to the top. But, if we

can live up to non-violence in thought and deed, there will emerge an interracial society based on freedom for all.'

The statements above give dramatic proof of Dr King's philosophic indebtedness to Gandhi: 'Prior to coming to Montgomery', he has also said, 'I had read most of the major works on Gandhi and also Thoreau's *Essay on Civil Disobedience*. Both of these streams of thought had profound influence on my thinking. I firmly believe that the Gandhian philosophy of non-violent resistance is the only logical and moral approach to the solution of the race problem in the United States.'

Some Southern whites have met the non-violence with violence: Dr King's home was bombed. To the angry Negroes who gathered at his home, King said: 'We believe in law and order. We are not advocating violence. We want to love our enemies. I want you to love our enemies. Be good to them. Love them and let them know you love them. I did not start this boycott. I was asked by you to serve as your spokesman. I want it to be known the length and breadth of this land that if I am stopped, this movement will not stop. If I am stopped, our work will not stop, for what we are doing is right. What we are doing is just—and God is with us.' Dr King and many of his co-workers were indicted for violating a 1901 Alabama anti-boycott law. State officials sought an injunction charging the Montgomery Improvement Association with operating an illegal transit system to transport Negroes to work, but before the state could obtain an injunction, the United States Supreme Court declared bus segregation in Montgomery illegal.¹

The *New York Times* account² of the ending of segregation on the Montgomery buses noted that as 'one of the oldest race barriers in this deep South community fell this morning following a formal order from the Supreme Court to abolish segregation in local buses, nothing happened to indicate that Montgomery's 75,000 whites and 50,000 Negroes looked upon the historic event as anything but a natural development'. The reporter also noticed that although some white passengers made uncomplimentary remarks, Dr King's emphasis on 'love between all men has been adopted by the Negro community not only as a tenet, but as a tactic in their struggle for racial equality'.

An indication of the widespread dissemination of the Gandhian method has been the publication of the cartoon booklet, *Martin Luther*

1. *Times*, loc. cit.

2. *New York Times*, 21 December 1956.

King and the Montgomery Story, obviously directed towards the Negro masses. The first frame shows Dr King in the pulpit saying: "Years before our walk to freedom, a country of 300,000,000 people won its independence by the same methods we used. . . ."

"Mahatma Gandhi started his campaign for freedom in India in 1919. It looked hopeless. The British Empire was the strongest the world had ever known. India's people were poor and powerless. The new campaign meant suffering and even death. When Gandhi called on the people to fast and pray to protest (against) a bad law, the British shot down hundreds of them at Amritsar. It raised horrified protests all over the world. Again and again they put Gandhi in prison, but that did not stop him. He would wait patiently, thinking and praying, and as soon as he was out would start again.

"Millions of the poorest people in India were called 'untouchables'. They could not even use the public highway. Gandhi renamed them "*Harijan*—Children of God", and led them to stand on the forbidden road. It took sixteen months of standing, but then the police gave in and let them pass.

"The British put a tax on salt, and said Indians could not make their own salt. Gandhi walked with his followers 200 miles to the sea to break the law by gathering salt. Soon the jails were overflowing with Indians. . . . and the British did away with the Salt Act.

"It became harder and harder for the British to keep control. Their jails were filled with India's best-loved leaders, including such men as Nehru, who later became Prime Minister. Besides, the news that British soldiers were shooting unarmed men and women and putting leaders in jail, was troubling the British at home.

"Finally the British gave in and granted India's independence. Gandhi had made a revolution without firing a shot.

"It wasn't easy. It took years of non-violent struggle, many long hours of prayer and suffering. The Indians were shot and beaten, but never licked. They won their freedom—and something else, too. They won the friendship and respect of the British. This is the unusual thing about non-violence—nobody is defeated; everybody shares in the victory."

Obviously Chester Bowles's recent informative article in the *Saturday Evening Post*² entitled "What Negroes can Learn from Gandhi" is entitled, *Negroes have learned from Gandhi*.

2. *Saturday Evening Post*, 1 March 1955.

In Search of New Horizons

WILFRED WELLOCK

We have reached the era when the mechanisms and speeds of communication have made it possible and totally necessary for the people of every country to know what its near and distant neighbours are doing and thinking, what is the nature and worth of their daily existence, what values they esteem and how stable and satisfying is their civilization.

I imagine there are many Indians who, in contemplating Western civilization, especially the increasing emphasis that it places on money and material values, or what in the West is called 'consumption of goods and services', wonder whether Gandhi's teaching regarding the relationship between material and spiritual values has any meaning in the West. At the same time there are many in the West, including myself, who perceive that Western values are very attractive to many Indians, and that there is some danger that India and other Eastern countries may clamour after those values and lose sight of their ancient spiritual values, the values which Gandhi and other Indian prophets and seers have sought to perpetuate.

Eastmen should know that the materialism that is now rampant in the West is a fairly recent phenomenon. It has become the monster we now behold it during my life-time. In the main, it is a product of the Industrial Revolution. That revolution radically changed the nature and course of our industrial and social life. In a comparatively short time thousands, then millions, of craftsmen were driven by their necessity to give up their callings and enter factories which grew in size as the years passed until they embraced tens of thousands of workers.

Except for a few individuals, neither church, state nor any cultural organization opposed this process. Hence the new manufacturers, whose object was to make money, amass fortunes and gain social prestige,

financial, social and political power, went ahead with their huge organisations disregarding for the most part the sufferings and complaints of their workers. These included not only long hours of labour, abominably low wages and wretched housing conditions, but also much spiritual suffering due to the loss of freedom, of the right to responsibility and to creative self-expression, and of the satisfaction of doing and making things of beauty and high quality for neighbours, thus winning their esteem and respect which they valued as highly as the money they received for their work.

In this situation we have the beginnings of the materialism that is now raging and spreading throughout the West. The authors of it lost all sense of human and spiritual values, even while professing Christianity and claiming that their prosperity was a sign of God's favour. Whereas in truth they have been guilty of driving economics from religion and ethics, a process that is still going on and will continue until there is a spiritual awakening, or civilization collapses as the result of spiritual decay.

These basic evils were bound to affect the workers in due course and cause them to combat their employers on their own materialistic grounds. For many years they had to fight for bread and wages capable of keeping body and soul together. But always they had in mind, and openly proclaimed, their desire for industrial freedom, responsibility, and a share in the organisation and control of the means by which they earned their bread. They agitated for a big co-operative movement for the purpose of achieving what they called an 'equal society', also for trades unions for the dual purpose of gaining better wages and a share of control. Then came Socialism, first as Christian Socialism, and later as the creative, cultural Socialism of William Morris, Edward Carpenter, etc.

It is, however, highly significant that none of these Movements have succeeded in achieving their spiritual objectives, but have been driven by sheer economic forces to concentrate on the more mundane factors, such as wages and hours of labour. The inevitable outcome has been to lay increasing emphasis on material values. In order to find relief from the terrific frustrations of repetitive labour, the spiritual barrenness of becoming the slaves of machines, the workers have demanded more and more money and deliberately reduced their output in order to get it. The outcome is that very often unskilled or semi-skilled labour is as highly paid as skilled. Hence we are now in an age where money values reign, where the chief aim in life is to 'have a good

time', enjoy maximum consumption of goods and services according to one's choice of pleasure or self-indulgence. Increasingly, today, money is expected to buy everything that is necessary for 'a good time'.

In a recent booklet, *Which Way, America? Which Way, Britain?*, I described the effect of this way of life upon the minds and lives of the American people. I pointed out that on the materialistic plane there is no end to the multiplication of wants, that the more money one spends the more one wants, whence one inevitably becomes the slave of the advertisers, and of 'Miss Jones', as we say in Britain and America. I chose America because she has the highest living standards in the world, and at the same time the highest *per capita* bare purchase indebtedness. The outcome is millions of minds depressed by a heavy weight of debt, a condition which unfit them for the higher functions of responsible living, the safeguarding of liberty, the culture of mind and spirit and the intercourse of cultured persons.

In some measure all the Western countries are now travelling this materialistic road. Within the last few months a number of our best known and well established banks have invested many millions of pounds in insurance companies which finance bare-purchase trading concerns. They are convinced that this kind of trading is going to grow, and that its prospective profits are high.

Thus travels the Western world towards extravagance, irresponsibility and eventual destruction, and often in the name of Christianity, when in fact the crucified Nazarene, whose simple life of humble self-giving was intended to reveal the nature and content of the good life, is buried beneath a load of wordy adulations which obscure the true nature of his life and teaching.

Only recently after I had given an address on what I described as the Gandhi-Vinoba social revolution in India, I chatted with an Indian student who said he was studying business organisation in this country. I asked him if he saw hope for India in Western industrial techniques and big-scale industrial organisation. He replied, 'Yes, I think they are necessary for us'. I then asked him what were his views on Gandhi and his mission regarding the future of India. His eyes sparkled as he said, 'All Indians reverence and believe in Gandhiji, but in some respects we interpret him differently'. I continued the discussion, but with the sad reflection that in India also there was the same tendency to follow the new stream of material prosperity in the name of a teacher who had denounced that way of life and predicted the eventual collapse of

Western civilization by reason of its gross materialism.

That prophecy Gandhi made exactly fifty years ago, unless, of course, the West changed its course. Happily today there are many signs of a spiritual awakening. Only recently I attended a small week-end conference which met specifically to discuss the steps to be taken to make the transition from our present materialistic to a spiritually directed civilisation. Fifteen people were present, and they included university professors, businessmen and people who had made a special study of existing national and world trends. There also attended by special invitation Jeyaprasada Nanayan, who was asked to present to us the challenge which Vinohā is now giving to India. His message shocked no-one, for the reason that all those present at that meeting recognised its truth and the urgency of it both for India, Britain, the West entire, and the whole world.¹ Indeed should India, the entire East, and also Africa try to build the new civilisation that is inevitable anyway by reason of modern science and its immense possibilities, on the model of Western civilisation with its rapidly rising devouring propensities, the doom of the human race can be foretold with a high degree of certainty.

In contrast, Vinohā has expressed the view that the two countries that are most likely to change this world trend and to inaugurate an era of cooperation and peace, are India and Britain. He has lifted Gandhi's concept of Trusteeship into the reality of village self-giving, whence every person gives of his best and makes his maximum contribution to the common good. In doing this he fulfils himself and at the same time reaps the abundant life of which Jesus spoke.

There lies the hope of India's salvation—and of the world's!

Non-Violence and the Law

HARRY WOFFORD, JR.

The law is a teacher. People learn to drive on the right side of the street by obeying the law requiring them to drive on that side. Citizens of the thirteen original states came to consider themselves citizens of the United States because the constitution of the United States was ratified, established and enforced. Without the working of the Constitution no amount of talk would have convinced Americans to abandon their parochial loyalties for a higher allegiance.

Thus the decisions of the Supreme Court fulfilling the Constitution's promise of equal protection of the laws are great and necessary milestones. But they do not mark the end of the road. They only point the way. And in fact, despite the impressive unanimity of the Court and the determination of the President to enforce the law, they seem to leave us at an impasse. For racial segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional and must be ended with all deliberate speed. But a substantial and dominant part of the public in a number of states is opposed to compliance with this and other applications of the constitutional guarantee of equal rights.

It will not be enough to get more court orders. Nor can bayonets be relied upon to do the trick. The law needs help. The law cannot act as teacher where the conditions necessary for the educational process do not exist. Where opposition to the law is violent and widespread the law may not be obeyed at all, or may be obeyed only in form while the spirit is submerged in a wave of irrationality.

The question then is what else can be done to mould public sentiment. How can we help the law? What can we do to break up the concentration of emotions on this issue, to disperse the hatred, violence and irrationality gathered around public school integration to take the

initiative out of the hands of racial demagogues, to release the forces of moderation, of ethics and civility and Christianity, of respect for law?

This is where non-violence and Gandhi and Martin Luther King and Ralph Abernathy and the Montgomery Improvement Association come in. It is time to reconsider Thoreau's *Essay on Civil Disobedience*. For there must be further actions, in and out of court, that go deeper in moulding public sentiment. It is time to light new paths for our legal brethren who too often take a too narrow huginous view of the law.

The Supreme Court, thanks to the civil rights lawyers in our midst, has ordained justice. But human nature is recalcitrant stuff and once again, albeit in pale and distant imitation, it seems that in the agonizing way of the New Testament it is necessary for the word to become flesh. Gandhi called it Non-Violence, or as he put it, living the Sermon on the Mount. As a lawyer I see it as a form of persuasion. And as a lawyer I would rather define what I mean by using cases.

In 1933 Dr and Mrs Thurman, while visiting Gandhi, asked him to come to America, not for White America but to help the Negro in his fight for civil rights. Gandhi said he had to make good the message of non-violence in India first, but added that 'it may be through the Negroes that the unadulterated message of non-violence will be delivered to the world'.

In 1951 a former associate of Gandhi, Dr Bhammanchar Lohia, visited this country and to American Negroes and whites who wanted to advance civil rights he prescribed jail-going and non-violent struggle against unjust racial laws and practices. No, said President Johnson of Pak, we are too weak a minority and here we have the law and the Constitution on our side, unlike the situation you faced in India. There are only a handful of Negroes in Montgomery who would stand together in any Gandhian struggle, sadly said that courageous Alabama NAACP leader, Mr E. C. Nixon, himself a veteran of many struggles. When at Hampton Institute in November 1953 I happened to propose that the Negro and white of the South try the Gandhian way a respected Negro leader who had known and loved Gandhi and who had tried to spread his message in America told me that he had about given up hope. The American Negro, everyone seemed to say, does not have the Gandhian dimension in him.

Then came the Montgomery bus boycott. And by Christmas 1955 the world knew that the Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama, were talking

with God, praying for those that oppose them, and regularly re-dedicating themselves to the methods of non-violence. Mrs Rosa Parks says that she had been forced to move many times before but that for some reason 'this time I just didn't move'. When the driver threatened to call the police she said, 'Then just call them'. With her arrest, the spark was struck that started the first great Gândhian fire in our midst.

A year later the world knew that the Negro of Montgomery had it in him. Under the inspired leadership of Martin Luther King and his brother ministers the Gândhian alchemy, as in India and South Africa, made heroes out of common clay.

A year later the Supreme Court struck down bus segregation in Montgomery as unconstitutional. 'All that walking for nothing', said a lawyer friend of mine. 'They could just as well have waited while the bus case went up through the courts, without all the work and worry of the boycotts.'

Would that have been better? Would it have been better if 40,000 Negroes had not spoken up against segregation with their prayers and their feet? Would it have been better if the ministers had never been arrested, if the bombs had not been exploded, if there had been a court victory without a popular struggle?

That is a rhetorical question because we all know that the Montgomery bus boycott was the most exciting and most significant thing that has happened in this country for a long time. Of course we are glad it happened. A new element came into our national life. A new dignity was added to the fight for civil rights. The words of the court took on substance and life, they had no hollow ring from on high, because they were part of a human dialogue, because in Montgomery there was a deep human response, because through the boycott public sentiment was moulded so that it became possible to establish the law.

We know this instinctively but we would do well to examine the nature of this new element and understand its implications. What Martin Luther King has given us is the undiluted message of non-violence which Gândhi wanted the Negroes finally to deliver to the world. That message can be summarized in these terms: We accept personal responsibility for injustice. We will take direct action against injustice without waiting for the Government to act or a majority to agree with us or a court to rule in our favour. We will not obey unjust laws or submit to unjust problems. We will do this peacefully, openly, cheerfully, ho-

cause our aim is to persuade. We adopt the means of non-violence because our end is a community at peace with itself. We will try to persuade with our words, but if our words fail we will try to persuade with our acts. We will always be ready to talk and to seek for compromise but we are also ready to suffer when necessary, to go to jail or risk our lives, to become witnesses to the truth as we see it.

At first this may sound un-American, for lately we have been committed to wait upon Congress and the courts—or the next election—for the resolution of all our troubles. But Gandhi got his theory of civil disobedience from Thoreau, and at least once before in our history when the law was at another impasse, with the Dred Scott decision and the Fugitive Slave Law, there was a fruitful era of non-violent action. The abolitionists awakened the conscience of the nation and set the stage for Lincoln by refusing to acquiesce in slavery. When Emerson came to ask Thoreau why he was in jail, the Concord prisoner asked, 'Why are you outside?'. Prison, he said, was apparently the place for fugitive slaves, Mexican prisoners, Indians, and honest men. 'Under a government which imprisons any unjustly', he wrote, 'the true place for a just man is also a prison'. Thoreau advised the abolitionists not to 'wait till they constitute a majority of one'. It is enough, he said, 'if they have God on their side, without waiting for that other one'. 'Unjust laws exist: shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavour to amend them at once?' Thoreau asked. His answer was this: 'If the injustice is part of the necessary friction of the machine of government, let it go, let it go: perchance it will wear smooth. . . but if it is of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law. Let your life be a counter friction to stop the machine. . . Cast your whole vote, not a strip of paper merely, but your whole influence.'

In Western law and philosophy there is ample theoretical justification for this approach. 'An unjust law is not a law', argued Aristotle, quoting Aristotle. Aquinas, quoting Augustine, agreed, and added that human laws unjust because contrary to Divine law or good ought never to be obeyed. St Thomas was less sure of what to do about laws contrary to human good, such as laws imposing unequal burdens on the community. He held that such laws were not binding 'in conscience' except perhaps to avoid 'scandal or disturbance'.

It is here that Gandhi, a British-trained lawyer, comes in, adding non-violence as the method of resisting injustice. Civil disobedience, he demonstrated, is not subversive of the law, does not lead to the kind of scandal and disturbance St Thomas feared. On the contrary it involves

the highest possible respect for the law. If we secretly violated the law, or tried to evade it, or violently tried to overthrow it, that would be undermining the idea of law, Gandhi argued. But by openly and peacefully disobeying an unjust law and asking for the penalty, we are saying that we so respect the law that when we think it is so unjust that in conscience we cannot obey, then we belong in jail until that law is changed.

It seems to me that is good legal theory. Justice Holmes once argued even that a party to a private contract has a right to refuse to comply with the contract if he is ready to pay the penalty. I am not going that far. I do not say we have a right to break the social contract which is our legal system, except through constitutional amendments. But I am arguing that under our social contract man is to be free, and that a free man should look on each law not as a command but as a question, for implicit in each law is the alternative of obedience or of respectful civil disobedience and full acceptance of the consequences.

Once man no longer believes that they as good citizens must obey any law passed by the legislature, no matter how bad, then they must ask themselves of each law, is this a law that I should obey? Is it a just law? Is it so unjust that it needs to be rushed from the very inception, and cannot wait the slow process of parliamentary reform? This choice we always have to make. It is the choice which makes us free. It is the freedom which Socrates felt on that morning when having refused to obey the law abridging his freedom of speech and having also refused to evade the law by escaping from Athens, he peacefully drank the hemlock.

Perhaps I have reached a realm beyond the law. But this I think is the spirit of our laws. The principle of an aristocracy is honour, says Montesquieu; of a tyranny, it is fear; of a democracy, it is learning. The law will play its full role as a teacher only when we look upon it as a question. The law is not some final arbiter. It is the voice of our body politic with which we must remain in dialogue. For the proposition to which we are dedicated is self-government. We must respond to the law, resist it, change it, and fulfil it, even as it challenges, changes and educates us.

Now there is at least one other vital argument which Gandhi and Martin Luther King would make, which is beyond the legal pale, but I will try to make it. 'Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering', said Gandhi. 'Rivers of blood may have to flow before we gain our freedom, but it must be our blood', he said to his

countrymen. And hundreds of thousands of Indians did withstand the blows of British clubs, about half a million courted jail, and not a few gave their lives without striking back.

What was Gandhi's justification for this ordeal to which he invited his countrymen, for this mass political application of the ancient doctrine of turning the other cheek? 'Things of fundamental importance to people are not secured by reason alone but have to be purchased with their suffering', said Gandhi. 'Suffering is infinitely more powerful than the law of the jungle for converting the opponent and opening his ears, which are otherwise shut, to the voice of reason.' 'The appeal of reason is more to the head', he said, 'but the penetration of the heart comes from suffering. It opens up the lower understanding in man.'

Does it? In practice does non-violent action change the minds and hearts of people? Is it practical in a democratic system of law where there is a constitution with a bill of rights to which one can appeal through regular legal channels? Is it advisable, when the spirit of violent disobedience is afoot, to adopt any methods other than strict reliance on law and order?

These questions answer themselves. For the very use of violence by the opponents of integration invites a non-violent response. At least it presents the alternative of acquiescence to intimidation or of the use of violence in return or of non-violent resistance. Gandhi often said he would prefer violence to cowardice, but he and you and I would prefer the courageous non-violence of Rosa Parks or of Elizabeth Eckford to the use of shotguns and switch-blades. The old law of an-eye-for-an-eye-for-an-eye leaves everyone blind.

Nor is violent, lawless insubordination the only kind of injustice facing the Negro. There are still many unconstitutional discriminatory laws on the books, and state and local governments can add new ones faster than the Supreme Court can strike them down. Nor does the existence of the Constitution at the top of the U.S. federal system mean that the majority in Congress or in a state legislature or in a city council may not enact an unjust law that is, at least for some time, upheld by the Court. Let us not forget the fugitive slave law. Civil disobedience of laws or local ordinances which we believe violate the bill of rights is the quickest and surest way of testing their constitutionality. In this sense, as Thoreau wrote, "they are the lawless of law and order who observe the law when the government breaks it".

Also in this age of great centralized nation-states and monster

bureaucracies we need some practical new Socratic technique to register popular dissent and to stir society from its dogmatic slumbers. Civil disobedience is an antidote to the centralization and standardization of our life, to the sense of fatality of the multitude as well as to the tyranny of the majority. The legislators, our government, if they give a minimum of good government, need have no fear of being stung too often, for the gadflies who will willingly go to jail to make their point are normally not so numerous.

Thus civil disobedience is a new answer to the question of how to divide our duties to Caesar and God. As the claims of Caesar have grown louder, our answer too often has been: we render unto Caesar that which Caesar says is Caesar's and go to Church on Sunday. With non-violence we can make real decisions—effective moral choices—in this appointment between God and Caesar, between our conscience and the state. That is what happened in Montgomery when churches filled on days other than Sunday and people started walking with God on their work days.

Was the Montgomery bus boycott effective in registering the convictions of the Negroes and in stirring the white conscience from its complacency? How can we measure the effect of the boycott—or of the courageous suffering of the children who have gone through jeering mobs and faced a line of guns in order to establish the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution? The heart has its reasons, and the doctors of the mind recognize the occasional need for shock treatment. I would guess that the boycott had the effect of an electric shock on both the white and Negro people of Montgomery, shaking and to some extent changing the usual thought patterns of that community. Montgomery whites could no longer be so sure they knew their Negroes, and the Negroes could begin to be sure that they were not the docile children that they had been pictured.

This is not to suggest that men are easily moved out of their mental ruts or that prejudice and irrationality can be cured by non-violent words or a year's walking. Nehru once remarked that the British were never so angry as when the Indians resisted them with non-violence, that he never saw eyes so full of hate as those of the British troops to whom he turned the other cheek when they beat him with lathis. But non-violent resistance at least changed the minds and hearts of the Indians, however ungovernable the British may have been. We cast away our fear, says Nehru. And in the end the British not only granted India freedom but came to have a new respect for Indians. Today a

mutual friendship based on complete equality exists between these two peoples within the Commonwealth.

I do not predict the same happy ending for Montgomery because integration is more complicated than independence. But I am sure that the Negro of Montgomery is already walking straighter because of the boycott. And I expect that this generation of Negro children will grow up stronger and better because of the courage, the dignity and the suffering of the nine children of Little Rock and their counterparts in Nashville and Clinton and Sturgis. And I like to believe that the white people of this country are being affected too, that beneath the surface this nation's conscience is being stirred.

I hope this is the case not just because the Gandhian theory seems right to me but because it is becoming clear that we are in for a season of suffering. The Constitution stands and it is colour-blind, but the Fourteenth Amendment will not become the living law of this land until it is understood as well as enforced. And we are a long way from that understanding. Angry passions and deep prejudices are being aroused, and even as victories for civil rights mount in the federal courts, the mountains of state and local laws and practices remain unmoved. Negro leaders continue to be arrested and persecuted under city ordinances, state laws continue to be cracked to circumvent integration, and powerful community pressures are being organized to support the whole web of racial injustice. What I hope is that recognizing the necessity of struggle and suffering we will make of it a virtue. If only to save itself from bitterness this generation of Negroes needs the vision to see its ordeal as the opportunity to transfigure itself and American society. If the jails must be filled, let them be entered, as Gandhi urged his countrymen, 'as a bridegroom enters the bride's chamber'. That is, with some trepidation but with great expectation.

It is a privilege that history gives only occasionally for men to become the instruments of a great idea. Non-violence is not a negative concept. Its corollary must always be growth. Gandhi always insisted that the other side of the coin of civil disobedience against injustice was constructive service to establish justice. And in the Indian struggle there was a rhythm of alternation between dramatic boycotts and jail-going campaigns and periods of steady, hard construction of a better India.

In South Africa, where Gandhi first experimented with his methods with an Indian community that was outnumbered ten to one by the whites, he began by listing all the grievances against the Indians by the

which, and by asking his fellow Indians to consider which of these grievances were justified and then to do something about remedying them. To the Indian merchants before him, known for slick dealings and sharp bargaining, he proposed more responsibility to the community. He thought all Indians could do something to improve the unsanitary conditions in the Indian sections of towns. Why wait for legal victories against discrimination for the necessary drain-cleaning, he asked. He organized constructive institutions to teach the impoverished Indians to read and write, to erase caste discriminations among the Indians themselves, to help end the demoralization of much of the Indian community.

I gather that it was in this spirit that the Montgomery Improvement Association was formed on the occasion of the bus boycott. As Martin Luther King said, 'We are seeking to improve not the Negro of Montgomery but the whole of Montgomery'. It was not an association to improve bus service by ending segregation, but an association to improve Montgomery. And, as could be said of every city in this country, that leaves a lot of improving to do.

Thus then is the rhythm beyond the law which I as a lawyer commend to your attention. Non-violent resistance to all forms of racial injustice, including state and local laws and practices, even when this means a term in jail; and imaginative, bold, constructive action to end the demoralization caused by the legacy of slavery and segregation, inferior schools, stigma, and second-class citizenship. The non-violent struggle, if conducted with the dignity and courage already shown in Montgomery and Little Rock, will itself help end the demoralization, but a new frontal assault on the poverty, distrust and ignorance of people too long behind God's back will make victory in the struggle more certain.

Thus in the way, it seems to me, for public sentiment to be moulded. 'The law will never make men free', Thoreau said, 'it is men who have got to make the law free'. That is only half true, for the law can help. But through non-violent action men, by becoming free themselves, in turn help our law at last to be free.

Three Early Letters from Gandhi to Gokhale

These letters belong to the brief one year period (December 1901 - December 1902) which Gandhi spent in India on his second return from South Africa. He had met Gokhale only five years earlier, during his first return to the country. On this present visit he stayed with Gokhale for a month in Calcutta, where he attended for the first time the annual session of the Indian National Congress, then went to Burma for a brief while, and on his return started on a tour through India, travelling third class in order to "acquaint myself with the hardships of third-class passengers"—an idea which Gokhale at first 'ridiculed' and later 'cheerfully approved'.

Per S.S. Gue
30 January 1902

Dear Professor Gokhale,

We expect to reach Rangoon tomorrow. The weather has been very fine. How I wish you had been on board! Your cough would have left you in two days. I hope however that you are feeling better and that you have taken proper advice.

How shall I thank you for all your kindness during the time I was under your roof? I cannot easily forget how anxious you were to wipe out the distance that should exist between you and me. I should be quite content to have the privilege of your confidence and guidance. More I do not deserve. It is my honest opinion—and I yield to no-one in my

honesty—that you have appraised my services to the country altogether too generously. You have unduly magnified little incidents of my life. Yet when I come to think of it, I feel that I had no right to question your taste on Monday evening. I was too presumptuous. Had I known that I would cause you thereby the pain I did cause, I should certainly have never taken the liberty. I trust you will forgive me for the folly.

Your great work in the cause of education has admirers even on board this little vessel.

I forgot to give the coachman a gratuity. Will you kindly ask Mr Bhalje to give him a rupee and the groom half a rupee?

Please remember me to Dr F. C. Rly.

I remain,
Yours truly,
M. K. Gandhi.

7 Mogul Street
Rangoon
2 February 1902

Dear Professor Gokhale,

As there was no post for Calcutta before Monday I postponed posting the letter written on board which I enclose herewith.

I was fortunate in just catching Professor Kishorewala. He left for Madras yesterday morning. The Professor did not like the Rangoon climate. It was too trying for him. He requires a bracing climate, which the Rangoon climate does not appear to be.

From a sanitary standpoint this is a very good place. The streets are broad and well laid out. The drainage system too appears to be fairly good.

I remain,
Yours truly,
M. K. Gandhi.

The Honorable Professor Gokhale,

Rajkot

4 March 1902

Dear Professor Gokhale,

Having passed five nights in the train, I reached here on Wednesday last, i.e. only a day later than I would have had I not stopped at the intermediate stations.

It was with very great difficulty that I found a seat in one of the intermediate carriages, and that after I offered to stand the whole night if necessary. As it was, it was merely a trick on the part of the friends of some of the passengers. The former had occupied all the spare room with a view to preventing any more passengers from getting in. They got out as soon as the guard blew the whistle for the train to go. There was absolutely no room in the third-class carriage. You cannot adopt gentlemen's time and travel third. From Bandra, however, I travelled third only. In your words, it was only the first plunge that was difficult, the after-effect was all pleasure. The other passengers and I talked freely and at times became very 'chummy'. Besides is probably the worst station for the poor passengers. Corruption is rampant. Unless you are prepared to bribe the police, it is very difficult to get your ticket. They approached me, as they approached others, several times and offered to buy our tickets if we would pay them a gratuity (or bribe?). Many avoided themselves of the offer. Those of us who would not had to wait nearly one hour after the window was opened before we could get our tickets; and we would be fortunate at that if we did so without being pumiced with a kick or two from the guardians of the law. At Moghadurai, on the other hand, the ticket master was a very nice man. He said he knew no distinction between a prince and a peasant.

In the carriages we were packed anyhow. There was no restriction as to numbers, though there were notices in the compartments. Night travelling under such circumstances does become rather inconvenient even for the poor third-class passengers.

There was plague inspection at three different places, but I cannot say it was carried out with any harshness. My experience is yet very little, but the picture that the imagination had drawn of the terrible lot of these passengers has become somewhat toned down. Five days can hardly afford sufficient data for drawing a fair conclusion. I feel all the richer and stronger in spirit for the experience, which I would resume at the very first opportunity.

I alighted at Besiroo, Agao, Jeypore and Palampur. The Central

Hindu College is not a bad institution, though it is difficult to speak with confidence on a hurried visit. 'The Dream in Marble' is certainly worth a visit. Jaypore is a wonderful place. The Albert Museum is a far better building than the Calcutta one, and the art section is by itself a study. The Jaypore School of Arts appeared to be flourishing under its Beglades superintendent.

I now come to the most important part of my letter. To Pitanpore I went to see merely the state *kardhār* who is a personal friend of mine. I casually mentioned to him that I might join you in collecting subscriptions for the Rānade Memorial Fund in April next. The state *kardhār*, Mr. Patwardi, who is a sincere man, says that it will be a great mistake to start it in April next, especially if we want to do Gujarat. He thinks that we would lose at least Rs 10,000 thereby. All the states are more or less groaning under the effects of famine, and he is strongly of opinion that the collection should be undertaken in December or January next. I place his views before you for what they may be worth.

Plague is raging in several parts of Kachhwar.

Please remember me to Professor Rāy.

I remain,
Yours truly,
M. K. Gandhi.

Please excuse the dirty typing.¹ The typewriter is quite different from the excellent one I had there. My things have not yet arrived from Calcutta.

1. The original typescript contains several corrections in its autograph.

The Impact of Gandhi on Hindi Literature

PRANASH CHANDRA GUPTA

Mahatma Gandhi appeared on the Indian scene round about the 'twenties and filled all spheres of national life with a new zest and vitality. The leadership of the Indian National Congress had been leading an arm-chair existence, when the Mahatma appeared demanding suffering and sacrifice. He drew the masses into a nation-wide movement which advanced in a series of spurts with a decade's interval between each one of them. The Mahatma did not allow the movement to bog down. He proscribed stern limits within which it was to develop. The younger generation, including Nehru and Subhas Bose, fretted against these limitations. They evinced the withdrawal of the movement after Cawnpore and also the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. The strategy of Gandhi consisted in working up a terrific pressure on the foreigner and thus forcing him to come to terms. This longed-for objective was reached only after mass-revolts had started in the army and navy and among the masses of the people.

The movement launched by Gandhi worked up the national consciousness to a fever pitch of excitement. His personality fired the imagination of the people. He completely identified himself with the masses, living like the poorest of the poor in the land. His was an amazing figure and it sometimes appeared that no one quite like him had walked on this soil since the days of the Buddha.

Gandhi's arrival on the scene in 1920 started a new mass awakening in India. It affected all spheres of life including literature. Hindi writers imbibed this new national consciousness and their writings express in a variety of ways the desire of our people to build a new and happy life. This desire was inherited by Hindi writers from an earlier period known as the 'Bhikarwadi Yuga'. During the 'twenties, known as the

'*Deivedh Yuga*' because of the dominating presence of Mahatma Prasad Deivedi, Editor of *Saransari* for more than a decade, many writers suffered imprisonment and various other hardships. This group of writers has been described by critics as national poets. They are Mikhhan Lal Chaturvedi, Sukhadra Kumbhar Chakla, Bhanuprasanna Sharma, 'Nastik', 'Trisul', 'Samski' and others. These poets participated directly in the political struggle and also poured out their heart in glowing songs of freedom.

There were others who avoided the dust and heat of political turmoil, but who deeply imbibed the new sense of patriotism. In this category we may include the bulk of contemporary Hindi writers. Some of them functioned as national songsters. The outstanding name among them is that of Masihill Saran Gupta, the doyen of Hindi writers today. In his *Shikhar Shikhar* he sang of the sorrows of Mother India. He mourns over the sad plight of our country under foreign rule, where once rivers of milk and honey had flowed through the land:

Where there had been wealth, plenty and purpose in life,
Who was famed throughout the world as Golden India,
There Destruction now dances his awful number;
The only job now is that of a servant.

Whatever way we look now, there is sadness;
The black night of despair advances on all sides;
The flames of misery constantly blast us,
Every day there is fresh calamity here.

Masihill Saran Gupta came deeply under the influence of Gandhi and his teachings. He donned *khaddar*, and when the Second World War began he was imprisoned along with his younger brother, Syedatun Saran Gupta, also a reputed poet and novelist. Syedatun Saran Gupta wrote a long poem on Gandhi, entitled *Ekpat*, on the occasion of the seventieth birth-anniversary of the Mahatma. Both the Gupta brothers write in simple, classic Hindi. Their personality has an unostentatious simplicity and it finds expression in all their writings. In his *Ekpat*, Syedatun Saran Gupta paints Gandhi thus:

In those eyes an expression of kindness,
On lips a smile playing freely.
A prop for the world in its sorrows!

The impact of Gandhi on the national consciousness has been

described vividly in the poem :

The people were fear-stricken,
Overwhelmed with terror—
This is a dread city on the road to freedom,
Carrying death in the very moment of birth.
The walls here are fetters for the body,
There is no limit to this bondage.

You were far, O kind saint !
You heard our cry—
Liberty was locked in a cruel prison ;
In the over-flowing river of life
There was a waterless isle,
The stream of truth
Was lost in the barren earth.

O Śiddhārtha !
You renounced all petty interests ;
You gave up love, home and property
And started on a new self-cult.

The poet also refers to the healing quality of Gandhi's message of love and ahimsa in a world torn by hatred and conflict. He writes :

Viewing the low deeds of man,
The naked, unrestrained dance,
One loses all faith of spirit.
A great repulsion arises in the heart.
In this terrible time,
O brother of man, you recite your spell of peace !

This poem epitomises all the influence of Gandhi on the nation and on Hindi poetry, making it simple, direct and unpretentious. The river of poetry here flows smoothly, rippling over even meadow-lands.

Others of this generation of poets deeply influenced by Gandhi's teachings were Mākhan Lal Caturvedi, Bālkrishna Śarmā, 'Nasin', Subhadra Kumār Chaudhī, Gya Prasad Śukla, 'Sanchi', 'Trital' and Rām Nāni Tripathī. Mākhan Lal Caturvedi was essentially a poet straying into the paths of politics. He desires to dedicate his muse to the service of the country :

I do not desire to decorate the daughter of a god ;
I do not desire to be an offering of love to the sweetheart ;

I do not desire to be a tribute on an emperor's corpse ;
I do not desire to be a proud offering to the gods.

O gardener, pluck me
And cast me on the path,
Where the brave soldiers of freedom
Pass to offer their lives to the motherland !

Similar sentiments pervade the work of the other nationalist poets named previously. They write simple verse, sometimes drawing on folk-songs, as Subhadra Kumari Chauhan in her famous poem on the Rani of Jhansi. In the writers of the next generation there is a further radicalisation of tone and echoes of this are audible in the poetry of 'Navin' too. The temper of 'Navin' has a quality of fire and fury which nothing could tame. He writes :

O post, let me hear a tune
That will throw the world into a tumult ;
A wave may rise from here
And another from there,
Life may be in jeopardy
And the cry of distress rise into the sky.

'Navin' considered the suspension of the movement by Gandhi after Curf-Curf as a defeat and mourned over it. In his *Song of Defeat* he writes :

Today the edge of the sword is blunted,
And empty is the quiver ;
The banner is drooping,
The arrow has missed its aim.
The ranks of advancing armies
Have been suddenly dispersed ;
The pride of feeling suffers a shock,
We have lost all glory,
Do not grieve me, O history,
I have lost all patience

Today the sword is blunted,
And empty is the quiver !

The next generation of Hindi poets is known as the 'Chhayvadi'*. Their poetry represents rich, complex and variegated reactions to life and seems at first glance to be far removed from it. Basically, however, these poets are deeply patriotic and the undertone of sorrow running through their work echoes the sufferings of a nation in travail. The spiritualism, the delicacy and the elusive quality are further influences of the Gandhian philosophy, which has strong strains of other-worldliness in it. Occasionally, however, the mist clears and we hear the poet bewailing the plight of the nation today. Sumitranandan Pant compares the tragedy of today with the golden past :

Today Spring breathes desolate sigh
As though it were winter ;
The twig which had bent down
With the weight of blossoms in spring,
Today in its helplessness cries :
Youth is a terrible burden !

'Nirala' draws the picture of a beggar, symbolical of the poverty of India under British rule :

He comes —
He comes on the road with a broken heart ;
His belly and back have become one,
He leans heavily on his stick ;
For a handful of grain, he breathes hunger,
He opens wide the mouth of his tattered old *khaddi* ;
He comes on the road with a heart broken.

With the middle of the 'thirties, the Chhayvadi acquired greater social awareness and we have from the pen of Sumitranandan Pant the finest poem on Gandhi in Hindi. This deepening social awareness came to our writers owing to the intensification of the economic struggle and the organisation of such bodies as *khadi sabhas* and *mandal sabhas*. Pant hails Gandhi as the redeemer of India's millions in a poem of such strength and beauty :

You have no flesh, no blood,
You are only a bag of bones,

1. The term 'Chhayvadi', originally derogatory in sense, has come to denote a group of Hindi poets that came into prominence in the 'twenties and was largely influenced by Tagore and the English Romantic poets.

You are pure spirit, enlightened and wise,
You are ever-old and yet ever-new.

You are flesh, you are blood and bones
That will build the body of a new era,
You are blessed ! Your resurrection
Is the basis for the comfort of all
From this body which has consumed all desire
The world will build a new life
And satisfy all desires.

In his poem Pant eulogises the spiritual qualities of Gandhi and his faith in the power of the human spirit being greater than any brute strength. Pant was later on drawn towards Marxism and in another poem in *Yagorod* he balances the contributions of Gandhism and Socialism. He writes :

Communism gave to the world a new awareness of matter ;
It reveals to us a new science of history concerning life ;
Communism gave to the world a great collective democracy ;
It rescued the world from the sorrows of the world of matter.
The subjective world had lain lifeless for centuries ;
Communism gave it a body and a new glory.
Gandhism gave to humanity a new respect in the world ;
It sought to create a new culture based on truth and ahimsa.
Gandhi gives us an abiding faith in life ;
It gives us a consciousness of the great strength of man.
The individual, fulfilled, can give new life to the world ;
Humanity rushed can redeem life from its brute shackles.

With the middle of the 'thirties the tone of Hindi writers becomes increasingly more bitter. We may notice this in the work of such followers of Gandhi as Bhalpur and 'Dinkar' as well as in that of Marxist writers. The work of Prem Chand too reflects the ever-deepening crisis in the political culture of our country. The British seemed to be in no mood to depart, while the economic sufferings of our people seemed to be ever-increasing. 'Dinkar' had the spirit of revolution in ringing tones :

Dogs have milk and butter, but children go hungry ;
Clinging to the bosom of the mother they shiver as night ;
They pay their debts by selling clothes that cover their bodies ;
The arrogance of palaces then offers to me a challenge

The admiration for Gandhi was shared by the young Marxist poets,

Narendra Śarmā and 'Suman', who wrote some of the best poems in Hindi after his martyrdom. Many had been deeply moved by his personal sacrifices and suffering. After the martyrdom there was a revolution of feeling in the country against the creed of Godse. Sumatrisandan Pant and 'Baccan' brought out a volume together entitled *Kāshī ke Pāsh*. In the foreword to this volume Pant observes: 'Whereas we achieved freedom through the tireless efforts of the Mahātmā, his great personality has also given us a deep cultural aspiration. The truth based on ahimsā which he brought to life from the mire of politics forms the seat of the goddess of culture'.

One of Pant's poems in this collection sums up beautifully Gandhi's contribution to culture in the world context of today :

He was truly the son of a god, the people's loved Mohan ;
He sanctified the earth by touching it with the feet of truth ;
Various heroes of former ages strode in his company—
Rama, Krishna, Chaitanya, Jesus, Buddha and Mohammed.

His life, free of secrets, was an inspiration to art ;
His pure laughter opened a window unto heaven ;
His high ideals illumine the heart of the people ,
His life's dream became the nation's awakening.

Distressed by the sophistication of the world's culture
He rescued in the people a love of simplicity ;
On this earth weary with the burden of mechanization
He exalted the beauty of man superior to the gods.

He gave new life to popular truth by sacrificing himself ;
He laid the foundation of a new culture-consciousness on earth.

Of the next generation of poets, 'Baccan', Narendra Śarmā, 'Dinkar' and 'Suman' paid glowing tributes to Gandhi's spiritual qualities and his service to the nation. 'Baccan' compared Gandhi's death to the lamp of the nation which had now gone out. He was unconsciously echoing the anguished cry of Nehru's heart : 'The light has gone out of our lives'. Narendra Śarmā, in his book *Rātra-raman*, calls Gandhi 'the moon of peace'. He writes :

For the people's sake, O Deva,
You bore everything, you did everything !

Wealth, affluence, comfort, family-name—
 You gave up all !
 All ambitions, love of life,
 The beloved companions of years, wife—
 You sacrificed all for the people's good.

O leader, you were defeated a hundred times,
 But you remained unvanquished !

The joy or pain of victory or defeat
 Has no influence on the course of war ;
 Was it because of this
 That the cruel sword yielded before the tender leaf ?

For the sake of the people, O *Devi*,
 What did you not do ?
 What did you not suffer ?

Turning from poetry to fiction, we find that the first generation of Hindi novelists and short-story writers had come deeply under the influence of Gandhi and his teachings. Among the outstanding masters of the 'Thirties were Prem Chand, Vivimbihar Nāth Sarmā, Karṇik and Sudarśan. Their attitude, influenced by Gandhi's teaching, was deeply humanist. Their work is fired by the emotion of patriotism. They eulogise the sentiment of unity among Hindus and Muslims and write in very simple Hindi, accepting into their diction words of common currency.

Inspired by the freedom movement of earlier years Prem Chand wrote his first collection of short stories in Urdu, *Sar-e-Panā*. This was proscribed by the British government and all available copies of it were burnt under the orders of the district magistrate of Gorakhpur. The 'Thirties inspired the collection of patriotic stories known as *Sar-e-Jūd*. The novels of Prem Chand bear strong marks of Gandhian influence, though with the progress of the 'Thirties other influences too make themselves felt. The first novels, *Devdās* and *Prasiddhān*, pose Utopian solutions of social problems, though the problems are posed with intensity and passion and the novels are deeply humanist in tone. In *Rasphān* the coming of factories is denounced as the source of all evil, though the cheap disposal of land is justly condemned. In *Gadhī*, however, there is a deepened consciousness of basic problems and no facile solutions are advanced. Prem Chand turned to the villages and depicted the life of the peasantry more powerfully than any other Indian writer has done so far. This too was an emphasis which Gandhi had introduced into the national consciousness of India.

In his short stories Prem Chand exalts noble human impulses and draws fine and stirring portraits of men and women from all communities and layers of life. Hindu and Muslim mix freely together in brotherly love and amity. Such qualities abound in the work of Kaulik and Sudarshan too and the influence of Gandhian ideas on their work is constantly felt by the reader.

Novelists of the post-Prem-Chand era reveal few traces of Gandhian influence in their work, though some of them were devoted to Gandhian ideals in their life. Jeevendra takes up a humanist attitude in his earlier work. *Parokh* and *Tyāgapatra*, though his complicated thinking blurs and obscures the thrust of some of his later work. In his latest novel, *Aparadhehina*, politics is dominated by alien figures and it is difficult for the reader to follow the ramifications of the author's thinking. His short stories are often very simple and naive pictures of life and they adopt a style, simple and transparent, and graceful in its vocabulary and modulation. The innate good quality of his work is to be attributed to the influence of Gandhian ideas on the author's mind.

Shyamsuri Chandra Varma drew near to the Gandhian viewpoint in politics, but not in his basic attitude to life which often tends to be mocking and satyr-like. This is obvious from such works as *The Ferry*, *Isolation*, *Do Baithe* and *Tyāgapatra Nāya*. The first three books are dominated by an impish spirit of debunking and the last-named work is filled with a bitterness and dislike for certain progressive strands in Indian life which, to say the least, is not Gandhian.

Two other outstanding names in the history of this period, Yashpal and Agreya, came under other influences, those of Marx and Freud. Yashpal criticised the teachings of Gandhi severely in many of his works, notably in his *Gandhiji ki Sam-sarksh*. Some later novelists like Anant Lal Nigam and Venu Prabhakar again reveal the influence of Gandhism in the innate humanism of their work. Some of the younger writers of today, notably Nigarkjuna and Renu, have been developing the regional novel. They write about the life of the peasantry in their respective regions, Mithila and Purnia, with intimate knowledge and microscopic fidelity. This interest in rural India and the peasantry is a natural literary influence of the life-long devotion of Gandhi to the layer of Indian life. The portrait of Yaman Dasa in *Maulā Jhool* is the fine quintessence of Gandhism in the form of a living character. It is significant that the uncompromising devotee of Gandhi is martyred by those who profess to follow the same master.

This naturally takes us to the latest political manifestation of

Gandhism is Indian life, everywhere. Another young writer from Bihar, Uday Raj Singh, portrays the emergence of the Shiksha movement in his novel, *Shiksha Senjya*.

Drama is the weakest link in Hindi literature today, though several writers of merit have tried to enrich it. After Bhāratendu the greatest name in Hindi drama is that of Jayashankar 'Prasad'. His plays are filled with the spirit of patriotism, but direct traces of the influence of Gandhism on his work are few. His love of country is expressed in extolling the glories of ancient India and in songs like 'Glorious is this sweet land of ours'. In his allegory, *Khand*, he extols the simple life and attacks the luxury and licence which modern civilization brings.

Among contemporary Hindi dramatists, Seth Gaurind Das has written a large number of plays dealing with various social and political themes from the Gandhian view-point, but we are unable to say that these plays reach an exceptionally high literary level, though they acquire significance as the work of a prominent political personality.

Other leading dramatists, Laland Narayan Misra, Uday Śankar Shastri, Raj Kaml Varma and Upendra Nath 'Aik' are influenced by the contemporary thought-processes of India in which Gandhism is an important strain, but none of these writers is in his make-up specifically Gandhian.

The teachings of Mahatma Gandhi have been deeply imbibed by the spirit of India. They are in tune with our ancient traditions of thought and feeling. They teach us to value the higher things in life, to ignore selfish, material gains, to weed out egoism and vanity. They teach us to be human in our dealings with our fellow-beings all over the world, to banish hatred and bitterness from our hearts. It may be said that these things have gone into our blood and find expression in all that we feel, think, say and write. In many rich, complex and subtle forms, the teachings of Gandhi appear in all that is being written today in India, though it is not always easy to analyse and trace this influence.

Gandhian Memories of Forty Years Ago

B. NATHAN

Gandhi returned to India finally in 1915, after a hectic life in South Africa where he made history by launching the novel passive resistance movement against racial legislation. It was a time of great crisis (when was the world free from any crisis?) when the Great War was on, and nations great and small, armed to the teeth, found themselves plunged into the world conflagration, some with the Allies and some with the Central Powers. India, dominated by Britain, found herself on the side of the democracies. The country itself, then as now, was riddled with factions and parties calling themselves moderates and extremists, Congressmen and Home Rulers, owing allegiance to¹ Gokhale and Mohli on the one hand and Tilak or Bhasani on the other, and altogether presenting a spectacle of divided loyalties. Gokhale, whom Gandhi claimed as his guru, had wisely asked him to tour the country, study its problems and get to know the leaders and people before expounding his own views and plunging into the fray. That was a wise and cautious advice; for whatever party Gandhi chose to join was sooner or later bound to feel the impact of his genius and take the shape he chose to give it. Gandhi as we know chose the Congress, remoulded it nearer to his heart's desire, and ultimately made it the vehicle of his own ideas and programs. It is fascinating to speculate what would have happened if Gokhale had not passed away when Gandhi took the field. That is one of the great 'ifs' of history. We know how deeply they respected each other; but each of them had formed his habits of thought and outlook and methods of action and they were both so masterful that it is hard to imagine either giving up his own views or ways in deference to the other. I fancy they would have respected each other and gone their own ways, even as Gandhi, differing

1. The names which follow refer of course to Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Panchabhai Mohli, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Anant Bhasani.

from his 'Gandhis' Tagore or Sargol or Sistr² continued to hold his own, and despite repeated tokens of respect, pursued his course with undiminished vigour and consistency. For close upon three decades Gandhi dominated the scene as none ever did before, and the second quarter of the century may well go down in history as the Gandhian era.

In this article I am concerned with Gandhi as he moved about from place to place studying the situation in the years before the 'twenties, contacting people of every strata of society and discussing current problems with leaders of public opinion of every shade of political or social thought—officers of governments, titled dignitaries, Congressmen, Home Rulers, peasants and mill-handa, not excluding underground workers and anarchists. All had free access to him and shared his confidence.

One of the most infallible tests of character in a public man is his attitude towards his political opponents. Now for many years Gandhi had been in the public eye leading large masses of men, arrayed against authority, now against convention, often against powerful factors and vested interests. Few men held more uncompromising views on a diversity of matters. When once he had made up his mind, his loyalty to his convictions as to his colleagues was unwavering. His dogmatism extended to almost every field of intellectual, moral and social thought. He was well known to oppose the whole tendency of modern machinery and seemed like the monks of mediaeval Europe all abroads of modernity in any form. His religion was an intensely personal affair—a rigorous asceticism, coupled with a beautiful tenderness for life, and a most catholic form of cosmopolitanism. His politics was a method of self-discipline and sacrifice, seldom achieved except under a military order with the enemy at the gates threatening destruction—and yet Gandhi would accept no violence, however disciplined. His social humanism were equally abhorrent to the orthodox. He condemned our universities and held that they had only manufactured men with a 'slave mentality', fit for no noble work. And then with blissful forgetfulness, as they thought, of all laws of political economy or the frailties of human nature, he asked the whole country to discard the mills and take to spinning yarn—an unending and dreary occupation for all and sundry. Railways, law courts, schools, castes, the hierarchy of social and political orders, all should go under and the world made a rabala rava for a new Utopia of clean souls and diligent hands. Well, these are not exactly views that could go unchallenged. I am not going to argue the correctness or otherwise of

2. Tej Bahadur Sargol

3. Shreevika Sistr.

these opinions. We should not have one but many treatises to discuss them. But the fact remains that he had roused many elements in opposition, some of them well organized and well equipped for thwarting what they deemed anarchical and revolutionary concepts. There is no doubt that they considered him reactionary and dangerous and knew that no compromise with him was possible. But two things they denied not. Gandhi's sincerity and a quite understandable though impossible philosophy. They knew that Gandhi was a clean fighter. It was this aspect of Gandhi that inspired respect for his character and admiration for his tact. Others have assailed him, misinterpreted him, distorted his views, slandered and calumniated him. But Gandhi, like his friend and colleague the late Maulana Azad, answered them with noble endurance and nobler silence. He had never once stooped to their tactics. While he had censured "wicked" and "atavistic" institutions with the stern denunciation of the prophets, he fought his opponents with clean weapons and with no malice. Stubborn in his beliefs, even against the advice of his best friends (loyalty to whom had been one of the most beautiful traits of his character), he was in all controversies the pattern of a perfect gentleman.

Gandhi was so gentle in his demeanour, so ready to listen to the other side, and so anxious in the pursuit of truth that one hesitates to call him obstinate. In controversy he was sweetly reasonable. Nothing marred the even serenity of his disposition and he never forgot the courtesies of controversy even when he was flagrantly denounced. In this respect he answers so perfectly to Newman's description of a gentleman that we may be permitted to quote the apt words of the Cardinal:

He is never mean or little in his disputes, never takes unfair advantage, never mistakes personalities or sharp sayings for arguments, mistakes evil which he dare not say out; if he engages in controversy of any kind his disciplined intellect preserves him from the blundering discourtesy of better though less educated minds, who like blunt weapons tear and hack instead of cutting clean, mistake the point in argument, waste their strength on trifles, misconceive their adversary and leave the question more involved than they find it. He may be right or wrong in his opinion but he is too clear-headed to be unjust. He is as simple as he is forcible and as fair as he is decisive.

It was thus no easy or comfortable thing to differ from such a man. One felt on such occasions almost tempted to say with Gekhal that one would rather go wrong with Michel than right with anybody else.

+

Beneath his infectious smile I felt the firm, decisive manner of the man of iron will. As I sat chatting, an elaborate scheme was unfolded, a strategic program of internic agitation was mapped out and vouchsafed. The conversation which began with a formal inquiry about the weather, steadily developed into an elaborate argument on the governance of India, or the fate of the Ottoman Empire; and I was led on gradually yet inevitably to denounce the abuse of armaments and the basality of diplomatic dealings. He put me again at ease by a sudden and bewitching twinkling of the eye as if to apologise gently for working himself into a fury and vehemence—though he seemed to betray neither—and he discoursed again in his habitually grave and solemn accents. Every hard or better stroke is avoided, passion burns low, and reasoned persuasion holds up the ‘guiding lamp’. It is not the flashing glance or the animated gesture that holds you captive. There is none of your clapping forms of declamation. Gandhi’s is of that best kind of eloquence which dispenses with tinsel rhetoric. It relies on a largeness and on-flowing volume of argument, stuff a fascinating medley of politics and economics, morals and metaphysics. A fervid note thrills the soul as he discants in clear, ringing sentences of faultless English. This man seems all-knowing. His shrewdness is beyond compare. He detects the fallacy in your argument with the eye of a falcon and he corners you with the fire and blazing blast of common sense just as Socrates would have held his ground in the market and the Forum in the spacious days of Periclean democracy, just as Dr Johnson would have done in the best literary circles of London. And yet you are sure there is some confusion in the very terminology. Gandhi reduces every argument to first principles. He is as formidable as Chesterton or Shaw, who weave their arguments round their well-trieed and unshakable beliefs.

+

Walking along the Madras beach one fine September morning we stood awhile by the ramparts of Fort St George admiring the splendour of the dawn. Pointing to the north-east corner of the Bay, I broke the silence with the casual remark: ‘It was from there that the *Endeavour* fired its shots and the city quaked in fear’.

Gandhi: Was there much loss of life?

Myself: No, not much, but that is because we replied from the fort and drove the enemy.

4 From some notes I made at the time.

I shocked to myself that I had at last cornered Gandhi and should not let this opportunity pass without challenging his doctrine of passivity in an era of aggressive violence. I was sure I had scored against him and I ventured again.

Myself: Now, what would have happened if we had kept quiet with folded hands. You talk lightly of disarmament. The City of Madras would have gone down in ashes if there were no guns to defend us.

Gandhi (turning to me with a curiously affecting smile of pity for my nervousness): Do you think the *English* had any particular quarrel with you in Madras?

Myself: It is no use arguing why the chose Madras. The fact is we were bombarded and many innocent people had to suffer.

Gandhi: Why didn't she attack Adyar or any neighbouring village? It would certainly have been easier for her to do that.

Myself: But the laws of war forbid the bombardment of undefended places.

Gandhi (quick like a bolt): Then let the fort go. The *English* came to destroy the fort which seems to irritate the enemy. If there were no fort, there would have been no bombardment.

There is in that answer a finality which is undeniable.

+

In those days when the Congress was one and undivided, the office of the *Indian Review* in Egmontside, Madras, was the meeting-place of men who moulded public opinion in the province. My memory goes back to the time when ardent Congressmen like Shri Krishna Aiyangar and Satyashankar gathered round the Editor's roll-top to discuss their agenda: for it was their small private parlor that really thought and planned for the big meetings. I recollect how the Mahatma—then plain Mr Gandhi of South African fame—squatting on a carpet and modestly reasonable, was trying his wiles on the stalwart liberals of Madras in a vain attempt to distinguish between legal and constitutional action. Shri Krishna Aiyangar, Ramaswami Aiyar and Venkataswami Siva, familiar with the Mahatma's inexorable logic, discreetly withdrew, while the parrying was continued by a stout-hearted lawyer. Those were days when prison was a dreaded

Demagogues, and decent men had a wholesome horror of it. 'If we defy the law we will be arrested and sent to jail', said good old Gopabandhwar Aiyar in all solemnity, as if there could be no more dreadful a calamity for the son of man. 'Exactly', echoed Gândhî, 'we will fill the prisons'—a thought that stupefied the constitutionalist. I think it was after one of these talks that Gândhî hatched his famous oath of non-resistance to the Rowlatt Bills. Thereafter for a whole generation prison itself became a place of pilgrimage, and a passport to power and responsibility in subsequent years.

+

Here is yet another of Gândhî's degrees, not dissimilar to the one I have quoted. It was, as I said, the time of the Great War. In the course of a lengthy interview, a press representative wound up by asking Gândhî: "Are you anxious to take over the whole control of the army at once or would you make an exception of that subject?" (referring to the demand for full Dominion Home Rule).

Gândhî: I think we are entirely ready to take up the whole of the army, which means practically disbanded three-fourths of it; I would keep just enough to police India.

Interviewer: If the army were reduced to that extent do you not apprehend anything aggressive from the frontier territories? There are half a million armed men on the frontier who have frequently attacked India. Why do you think they will refrain from doing so when India possesses Home Rule?

Gândhî: In the first instance the world's views have changed, and secondly the preparations that are now made in Afghanistan are really in support of the *Khalif*. But when the *Khalif* question is out of the way, then the Afghan people will not have any design on India. The warrior tribes who live on loot and plunder are given lakhs of rupees as subsidy. I would also give them a little subsidy. When the *arkh* comes into force in India, I would introduce the spinning wheel among the Afghan tribes also and thus prevent them from attacking the Indian territories. I feel that the tribesmen are in their own way God-fearing people.

Fancy the tribesmen at the spinning wheel! And yet what do we see today? The Afghans and the tribesmen are good friends of India and are by no means ignorant of the virtues of the spinning wheel.

Impact of Gandhi on Assamese Literature

OMPO KUMAR DAS

The development of modern Assamese literature has been rather slow. There was a time when Assamese writers had a feeling of disappointment and despair. Books in Assamese had a very limited circle of readers on account of wide spread illiteracy. The books which appealed to the rural masses were the mediæval *saheva* literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Till the attainment of independence in 1947 Assamese literature was plodding a weary way.

The year 1931 marks an important period in Assam. It was in this year that Mahatma Gandhi came to Assam for the first time with a message of hope and self-confidence and electrified an atmosphere saturated with lethargy and diffidence. The heart of Assam was infused with the spirit of freedom—freedom not only from the shackles of the foreign yoke, but also from those which keep educated men away from the rural masses and the ‘untouchables’.

The writers of this era awoke to see life from new angles, and the stubbornness of the imperialists on the one hand and the economic inequality of the people on the other reacted variously on their minds. Gandhi's new technique of struggle, his ceaseless effort to serve the poor and the lowly, to uplift the villages, to eradicate ‘untouchability’, also served to inspire their work. But genuine creative activity in the field of literature has yet to come to shape under the new impulse. The modern Assamese writer after independence has ceased to look to the richer sections of society for his material. He has turned his eyes to the poor and illiterate people inhabiting the villages and has focussed light on their simple lives, punctuated with shrewdness and greed on occasions. The poet of this era has not confined himself to the worship of nature

and beauty. He chants songs of universal love and universal brotherhood.

Candra Kumar Agarwala, who introduced a new trend in Assamese poetry by recognising the dignity and basic equality of man, wrote when Gandhi came to Assam in 1931 :

Solitary and alone was I in my cottage of leaves,
Meditating, poor and weak-hearted as I had been,
Concealing my feelings at this great distance,
While myself fading for lack of strength :
To do or not to do—
Hesitating like a coward. . .

A light has come to my cottage,
Pushing out the cloud of doubt,
Giving me strength in this wide universe :
I bow to thee, a humble follower.

The same poet wrote when Gandhi was ridiculed as a 'naked fakir' :

Steady in truth,
A frail body,
Nothing to conceal—
Naked fakir !

To serve the poor,
You have shed your heart's blood,
Given away everything,
Naked fakir.

These experiences behind prison bars in 1931 gave a new impetus to the poets to compose patriotic songs. A typical product of the period was Ambikagiri Choudhuri's powerful 'Song of the Cell'. The basic impulses which move him are an intense patriotism and a keen awareness of the inequality of man, the injustice of the caste system, and man's vanity and selfishness. He wants to raise the standard of revolt against the existing hypocrisy and hollowness and to create a new order of society. Says he :

Does freedom lie in uttering the mouthful phrase .
I am free ?
No, it lies in washing off the dirt and dross
of body and mind.
There is even Godliness in such cleanliness. . .

This is now, my soul, the way to restore
the lost Kingdom of Rām—

Jyotprasad Agarwala, who recovered Assamese music and its distinctive tunes from oblivion, raised chorion calls in wedding songs to the youth of Assam in 1931.

O world conquering youth !
Come out, come out, you are the children of revolution.

Three basic ideas inspired him—patriotism, freedom and a new social order. His songs inspired the youth of Assam to face all sufferings for the liberation of the motherland.

Nilmapi Phukan is another Assamese poet who has introduced lofty spiritual ideas into his poems. Emotion and thought are happily blended in his work. But this inter-penetration of thought and emotion, of science and lyricism, sometimes places him in the tradition of the metaphysical poets. He has published a number of collections of poems. His *Aghor* (*The Shackles*) reflects his experiences of jail life in the 1942 movement. Kamaladasa Bhattacharya, musician and actor, also sang in melodious tunes of his experience of the prison cell—the reward of patriotism.

There are many Assamese poets who have been inspired by Mahātmā Gandhi. The poems of Mahaball Devī are a matchless expression of her intense and overflowing love for her motherland. The feeling that nothing could be higher than service to humanity inspired her to wish that even after her death she would be allowed to continue her service to humanity :

A never I shall become to daily wash thy feet ;
I shall mingle with the dust . . .

The influence of Gandhian thought is noticeable in two categories of Assamese literature. In the first category we have the interpretations of Gandhi's life and teachings. Kanku Chandra Sarmā, who took part in the national struggle, wrote a life of Gandhi in verse, after the style of the saint-poets of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, whose works are still found to be popular with the rural masses. This book was prohibited by the British Government in 1931, and it was only during the Coalition Ministry of 1938 that it could be published.

There are other writers who, following in the footsteps of the

medieval poets, try to interpret Gandhi as an *avtar*. Such works are the *Kali Parba* by Brajanāth Medhi and *Gāndhī Gīrīvati* by Gokradhar Hazarika. In spite of their colourful presentation of Gandhi's life, these and other works try to interpret his thoughts in terms of Hindu religious beliefs and have thus become popular mainly with the rural masses.

A direct and independent interpretation of Gandhi was sought to be made by Biprī Chandra Bhagavati in his book *Gāndhīdāś* (Gandhism). His approach to the subject is intellectual and his method of analysis and expression simple. A work of a different kind is Mahitā Begam's *Mānāś Bāpā* (Bāpā, the Light of the Universe).

The second category consists of works where Gandhi's ideals and thoughts have gone into the texture and tone of the matter, without his influence being visible on the surface. Some dramas, novels, short-stories and songs may be mentioned in this connection.

In the field of fiction, Assamese literature developed very slowly till the 'thirties of this century. The older group of writers, who appeared in the first flush of the national renaissance, confined their creative work to legendary or historical plays, and after them there appeared to be a great lull in literary activity. The Assam Sahitya Sabha, which came into existence in 1917, declared a prize to encourage writers of fiction. Dandadith Kalita, with his deep study of Sanskrit literature, brought out a novel entitled *Sadāśat*. Depicting present-day urban society with all its vices and ailments, he sets off his hero *Dinabandhu* with an ideal of service to the people. This was a new note in the field of fiction. Dufiya Chandra Talukdar, another modern writer, has also written novels where the subtle influence of Gandhian ideas can be felt. His two books *Adarlapāṭā* and *Apāna* may be mentioned in this regard.

The national struggle and how the peasantry had participated in it forms the theme of some novels and plays. Bishnu Kumar Barua's *Assam Bara* (Highway of Life) is an interesting portrayal of the pastoral life of Assam. The story tells of an educated young man who breaks the sweet promises he makes to a village girl, of how the girl in her turn is married to another village youth and of how both of them join the freedom movement.

Navakanta Barua, another writer of the post-independence period, in his novel *Kapilgera's Sadāś* (Tale of the People on the Bank of the Kapli), tells of a young man who, having participated in the national movement and having served the flood-affected people living on the bank of the Kapli, developed a new outlook on life.

Dhanirath Sarmā, in his novel *Nadāi*, depicts the rural life of Assam and how Nadāi having been exploited by his master ventures out into a virgin land and is joined by a few others. Becoming a peasant proprietor, Nadāi feels the injustice of sharing only half the crop with his crop-sharer Kālāi and offers him a major share according to the number of his dependents. Nadāi looks upon his servant Bōdhan, a plantation labourer who had absconded from the plantation and taken shelter under him, with a catholicity which certainly marks a new departure in Assamese literature.

Atul Candra Hazarika, a reputed playwright, has written a number of poems on the eradication of 'untouchability', of which 'Kamrudi' and 'Mishikāi' are among the finest poetical expressions of one's feelings towards those who are neglected and treated as 'untouchables'. His drama *Kalyāṇ* draws pointed attention to this social evil.

The Quit India movement and the consequent tragic deaths of men and women figure effectively in the plays of Jyotirmoī Agarwālā, Satyaprasād Barua, Prītnā Phūkhan and Atul Hazarika, such as *Lobhāi*, *Jyoti-rēkha*, *Sarika* and *Asat*. The assassination of Mahātmā Gāndhī roused the conscience of the people and made them ponder over the existing sense of values. Some of the poets in Assam paid their homage in moving lyrics. Atul Candra Hazarika wrote with deep feeling: '*Atithai Bhagaban Mānabhar Śruti*' (God came in the guise of man), and Mahā Candra Borā sang: '*Ajā Kanyā Gāndhīi Tōmā*' (In millions of voices, your message would go forth).

The period after 1921 may be said to have released the creative urge of the poets and writers. Some of them were caught in the mighty upsurge of the Gāndhian ferment. Some of them tried to dig up the past, but not for its own sake, nor to find satisfaction in contemplating the ancient glories. With their own intuitions of reality, the writers tried to take their own readings on the present and the future. Dambhoīvar Niyog and Bisanda Candra Barua wrote patriotic poems in the context of the vanished glories of Assam.

Prasannaśāl Caudhuri, another modern poet of this period, feels for all the dependent peoples of the world and urges their freedom. His poem *Nāgpalāi Gīt* (Songs of the Plough) evinces his deep sympathy for the tillers of the soil.

Let the plough triumph,
Let the destitute be free :

Then only will descend the *Rāmrājya*,
The Kingdom of God on earth.

The intimacy of the flame that burns in the poem's consciousness is only the after-glow of the sun that had set.

The All-India Radio has given a fresh impetus to the creative musical talents of young Assam. The songs written for the radio reflect the spirit of the new age and the new outlook towards the neglected and the down-trodden. Bhāpen Hazrīkī, Malin Bara, Lakshmi Dās and a host of others pour forth in sweet melodious tunes their sympathy for those who are 'down-trodden and who have to carry on a hard struggle'. It would be wrong, as some do, to criticise Bhāpen Hazrīkī's songs as being communistic. After all it was Gandhi who inspired us to cultivate an active sympathy for these people.

The mind of man expresses itself in literature. We can examine its thought-content and assess how far the aesthetic crystallisation of the new consciousness of the age is taking place. But what about the folk songs, which do not very often see the light of publication, but pass from mouth to mouth in pastoral life? The mind of man and his reactions to the surrounding atmosphere are certainly reflected in these songs. Such Assamese folk songs as *Anām*, *Bhāskām* and *Ojapohi* have a tremendous influence over the people. Dr Baranāth Kumar Barua in estimating the value of these folk songs, writes 'These lyrical ballads of spring and marriage have left their indelible stamp on the tune and phraseology of modern compositions'. Composed on the spur of the occasion, with a ready wit, these ballad songs occupy a distinct place in Assamese life. The fact that Gandhi and his mission are referred to in these folk songs by unophisticated men indicate how far Gandhi has influenced the common man in Assam. These songs come out in a spontaneous emotion. Form and content, music and meaning, word and spirit—everything is symmetrically blended.

The bride and bridegroom are seated near the sacrificial fire and seated around them the girls of the village sing songs composed on the occasion. Naturally the womenfolk, used to spinning and weaving, take this occasion to refer to their craft.

Out comes the humming sound
The ginning and spinning wheels are making :
Swari we should win
With hand-spun thread.

'Hason Nām' is another category of pastoral ballad, sung by the rural youth at the time of Bihu :

Gāndhī has gone to woo swamy,
With a spinning wheel in his hand :
O Govind, O Rām !
Oh my dear sister, weave me a *caddie*
With hand-spun thread.
I will not take a *caddie*
Woven with foreign yarn !
O Govind, O Rām !

(It is the custom to present a piece of hand-woven cloth on the occasion of Bihu).

A question that comes up is why during these three decades dominated by Gandhi, when he so closely touched the emotional life of Assam, Assamese literature could not progress on the high road to development. Till 1931, there had not been many songs to inspire the people, except *Swamy Sang* by Padmanābhar Gohāi, Antrikāgiri Rāy Caudhuri's *Ao Bando Ki Chander* (How can we greet you ?) composed on the occasion of the Gauhati Session of the Indian National Congress and Umed Candra Caudhuri's songs. It was only in 1931 that Jyotiprasād Agarwala came out with muddering songs :

We are the youth on the bank of the Lohit,
Fear of death we do not have,

I do not propose to answer this question here. But it is a fact that Assamese literature is moving fast towards progress during these years. A good many talented writers have been silently devoting themselves to literature. The sense of direction which Gandhi instilled in the twenties is being felt today. The writer of today is no longer groping in the dark. Consciously or unconsciously he has taken the direction. There may be different trends flowing from different sources, exotic or indigenous, but they all flow to the living confluence that is Assamese literature. Gandhian ideology has consciously or unconsciously awakened the people. It has given them a new hope, and strengthened them with self-confidence. This new awakening is yet to unfold itself in many a creative activity to enable Assam to fulfil her cultural mission.

Dr King's Pilgrimage to Non-Violence

G. HENDRICK

Two weeks after I completed the article on Dr Martin Luther King's indebtedness to Gandhi, which appears elsewhere in this issue, Dr King published *Stride Toward Freedom* (Harper and Brothers, \$1.95) containing much new material on the civil disobedience struggle in Montgomery, Alabama. Soon after publication of the book, Dr King was in a New York City bookstore autographing copies when a demented Negro woman stabbed him; he has now recovered. It is indeed ironic that Dr King survived violence from white Southerners to be struck down by a member of his own race in a section of the country relatively free of racial segregation; the press has made much of the obvious parallels between the life of Gandhi and King and have continually noted that Gandhi was assassinated by a Hindu.

Stride Toward Freedom is a deceptively simple volume. In his account of 'a few years that changed the life of a Southern community', Dr King adopts an objective tone which succeeds in presenting his Gandhian philosophic position concerning the tragic, violent racial disturbances in Montgomery. Dr King returned to the South because of a 'moral obligation' to work for a solution of Southern problems, but although he felt that great changes were imminent in racial relations, he was not responsible for initiating the civil disobedience struggle.

After decades of humiliating experiences and economic exploitation, the Negroes began a boycott of the city buses after the arrest of one Mrs Parks for sitting in the White section of the bus. Dr King makes it clear in his book that his assuming of the leadership was almost accidental. He was elected president of the Montgomery Improvement Association, a position which was to be central to the movement, but had he had time to consider his nomination, Dr King writes, he probably

would have declined the position. Thrust into the situation, Dr King directed the course of the protest, shaping the movement with his Gandhian ideas.

While a college freshman, Dr King read Thoreau's *Essay on Civil Disobedience*, and he writes of his reaction: 'Fascinated by the idea of refusing to cooperate with an evil system, I was so deeply moved that I re-read the work several times. This was my first intellectual contact with the theory of non-violent resistance.' When he was in Theology school later, he first studied Gandhi and evaluated the Gandhian ideas: 'Gandhi was probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful and effective social force on a large scale. Love for Gandhi was a potent instrument for social and collective transformation. It was in the Gandhian emphasis on love and non-violence that I discovered the method for social reform . . .'

Because of the importance of non-violence in the Montgomery struggle, Dr King describes what he considers the 'basic aspects' of the philosophy: 'First', he says, 'it must be emphasized that non-violent resistance is not a method for cowards; it does resist'. Like Gandhi, Dr King dislikes the phrase 'passive resistance' which is sometimes used to describe the movement, for he believes in 'active non-violent resistance to evil'. He sees the second basic fact characterizing violence to be 'that it does not seek to defeat or humiliate the opponent, but to win his friendship and understanding'. Almost as a corollary, he says that the attack should be directed against 'forces of evil rather than against persons who happened to be doing the evil'. His fourth point is a statement of a belief Gandhian critics in this country have considered impossible to apply: 'A willingness to accept suffering without retaliation, to accept blows from the opponent without striking back. "Rivers of blood may have to flow before we gain our freedom, but it must be our blood", Gandhi said to his countrymen. The non-violent resister is willing to accept violence if necessary, but never to inflict it. He does not dodge jail. If going to jail is necessary, he enters it "as a bridegroom enters the bride's chamber". The willingness of the Negro to suffer in protest against restrictive laws and customs dramatizes the immorality of segregation most effectively'. His fifth point is that non-violence 'avoids not only external physical violence but also internal violence of the spirit. The non-violent resister not only refuses to shoot his opponent but he also refuses to hate him'. His last basic fact is that non-violence 'is based on the conviction that the universe is on the side of justice'. Consequently, the believer in non-violence has deep faith in the future.

This faith is another reason that the non-violent resister can accept suffering without retaliation. For he knows that in his struggle for justice he has cosmic companionship. It is true that there are devout believers in non-violence who find it difficult to believe in a personal God. But even these persons believe in the existence of some creative force that works for universal wholeness. Whether we call it an unconscious process, an impersonal Brahman, or a Personal Being of matchless power and infinite love, there is a creative force in this universe that works to bring the disconnected aspects of reality into a harmonious whole.

Dr King gives a minute account of the progress of the bus boycott and the attempts of the city officials to destroy the movement. Negroes at first asked only for justice within the existing segregation laws, but their demands were rejected. 'Justice and equality', Dr King came to see, 'would never come while segregation remained, because the basic purpose of segregation was to perpetuate injustice and inequality'. Although Dr King recognizes the economic basis of segregation, he does not emphasize the economic motivation of those forces which oppose rights for Negroes.

Dr King is hopeful that through continued non-violent resistance to all the manifestations of racial injustice the Negro can triumph over his legacy of 'slavery and segregation, inferior schools, stigma, and second-class citizenship'. John Woolmink, the eighteenth-century American Quaker, after a trip into the South observed that the vices and corruption surrounding slavery made a 'dark gloominess' hang over the land, and he saw, as Dr King's volume demonstrates, that 'the consequences will be grievous to posterity'. Dr King proposes a method to resist and finally reform the causes of racial injustice and also to heal the effects of the insidious racial hatreds of the past.

The closing statement in Dr King's book is a somber reflection upon the 'dark gloominess' which hangs over all the world, but he believes strongly that non-violence will provide an answer to many world problems. 'Arnold Toynbee says in *A Study of History* that it may be the Negro who will give the new spiritual dynamic to Western civilization. . . It may even be possible for the Negro, through adherence to non-violence, to challenge the nations of the world that they will seriously seek an alternative to war and destruction. In a day when *Spies* and *Explorers* dash through the stratosphere, nobody can win a war. Today the choice is no longer between violence and non-violence. It is either non-violence or non-existence. The Negro may be God's appeal to this age—an age drifting rapidly to its doom. The eternal appeal takes the form of a warning: "All who take the sword will perish by the sword".'

Dr Schweitzer and Respect for Life

The Editor, *Głoski Młody*.

Sir,

Your contributor, K.P. Śankara Menon, refers in his article, '*Absent and Respect for Life*', to Dr Schweitzer, in this connection bracketing him, fantastically, with Gândhi. Two things must be pointed out about Dr Schweitzer: (i) he is not, as his speech in connection with the Nobel Prize shows, a pacifist; and (ii) he is not a vegetarian. A third thing might be added, although it is subsidiary: he is not opposed to the use of animals for medical experiment—vivisection; he merely asks that there shall be the minimum of pain, through the use of anaesthetics. The issue of the slaughter of animals for food he—in his considerable writings on what he calls '*Reverence for Life*'—skillfully sidesteps.

These are facts, not assertions. The interested reader can check them for himself in Schweitzer's own writings, in the two volumes of his *Philosophy of Civilization: My Life and Thought and Civilization*

and Ethics. In the latter he has a chapter entitled '*Reverence for Life*', on page 256 of which he makes a compromise that would have been unthinkable to Gândhi: '*Whenever I injure life of any sort I must be quite clear whether it is necessary. Beyond the avoidable I must never go, not even with what seems to me insignificant*'. In the same chapter he has this to say regarding vivisection: '*Those who experiment with operations or the use of drugs upon animals, or inoculate them with diseases, must first have considered in each individual case whether there is real necessity to force upon any animal this sacrifice, and they must take the most careful pains that the pain inflicted is made as small as possible*'. He then goes on to discuss the importance of using anaesthetics for these experiments and declares: '*By the very fact that animals have been subjected to experiments, and have by their pain won such valuable results for suffering men, a new and special relation of solidarity has been established between them and us*'. (One is tempted to follow this

bit of honey with an exclamation mark). He then goes on to make the astonishing assertion: 'By helping an insect when it is in difficulties I am thereby attempting to cancel part of man's ever new debt to the animal world'.

Then comes the great evasion about the slaughter of animals for food. 'While so much ill-treatment of animals goes on, while the means of thirty animals in railway trucks sound unheard, while so much brutality prevails in our slaughter-houses, while animals have to suffer in our kitchens painful deaths from unskilled hands, while animals have to endure intolerable treatment from heartless men, or are left to the cruel play of children, - & all share the guilt' (It is apparently all right about slaughtering animals for food so long as they aren't left thirty in the trucks on the way to the abattoirs or killed by unskilled hands in the kitchen. Not a word about the iniquity of the sheer existence of slaughter houses, and Schweitzer is not in any case a vegetarian.)

In Part I of his *Philosophy of Civilization, My Life and Thought*, he also writes on 'Reverence for Life'. 'Every time I have under the microscope the germs which cause the disease I cannot but reflect that I have to sacrifice this life in order to save other life. I buy from natives' (incidentally non-whites are always 'natives' to Schweitzer, and at his hospital at

Lambaréné whites and blacks cut apart, nor has he ever trained up a black doctor in all these years) 'a young fish-eagle which they have caught on a sandbank, in order to rescue it from their cruel hands. But now I have to decide whether I shall let it starve, or kill every day a number of small fishes in order to keep it alive. I decide on the latter course, but every day I feel it hard that this life must be sacrificed for the other on my responsibility. Standing', he continues, 'as he does with the whole body of living creatures under the law of this dilemma (*Sollbist du sterben*), in the will-to-live man comes again and again into the position of being able to preserve his own life and life generally only at the cost of other life. If he has been touched by the ethic of Reverence for Life he injures and destroys life only under a necessity he cannot avoid, and never from thoughtlessness.' Since Dr Schweitzer is not a pacifist, is not against the terrible brutality of vivisection, not against slaughter-houses and the killing of animals for food, it would surely be more honest for him, as well as logical, to abandon all this high-flown pseudo-philosophizing about 'Reverence for Life'. And someone should explain to him that so far as killing for food is concerned there is no such dilemma, as millions of people the world over demonstrate it daily by their non-vegetarian eating habits.

Dr Schweitzer is a brilliant man,

a doctor of medicine, of music, of philosophy, but he is not a great man. Mahatmā Gandhi was not a brilliant man, but he was a great man—great as a moral force for good, as Jesus was, and Gautama who became the Buddha. Schweitzer does a useful work with his hospital for what he calls the 'natives' (he also calls them 'children' and 'barbarians' and his attitude to Africa is strictly paternal; he is, in fact, no more than a benevolent imperialist; this, also, is clearly set forth in his book, *My Life and Thought*) but not more than many a Christian missionary, if the truth be told—which about

Albert Schweitzer it seldom is, so concealed are the simple facts in the clouds of an unwarranted glory. He is surely the most overrated man of our times. How wrong that he should have been given the Nobel Prize when the one truly great man of our times, Mahatmā Gandhi, was not awarded it even posthumously. (But then since Churchill was awarded it for literature it hardly matters to whom it is awarded for anything any more.)

Ethel Mann

27 Barchley Road
London S.W. 19

It is impossible to sustain one's body without the destruction of other bodies to some extent. All have to destroy some life : (a) for sustaining their own bodies, (b) for protecting those under their care, or (c) sometimes for the sake of those whose life is taken. A progressive *ahimsā* will, therefore, commit the *ahimsā* contained in (a) and (b) as little as possible, only when it is unavoidable, and after full and mature deliberation and having exhausted all remedies to avoid it. Taking life may be a duty. We do destroy as much life as we think it necessary for sustaining our body. Thus for food we take life, vegetable and other, and for health we destroy mosquitoes and the like by the use of disinfectants etc.; and we do not think that we are guilty of irreligion in doing so. For the benefit of the species, we kill carnivorous beasts. Even man-slaughter may be necessary in certain cases.

Gandhi in *Young India*, 4 November 1926

Re-organization and Improvement of Tattva-Prachar

G. RAMACHANDRAN

Secretary, Gandhi Smarak Nidhi

The following program has been circulated to nearly five hundred full-time workers of the Gandhi National Memorial Fund scattered all over India by the Secretary who is also the Editor of this Journal. It is being printed here to give some indication of another aspect of the work being carried out by the Fund in India.

Considerable expenditure is being incurred by the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi on *tattva-prachar*¹ in most of the states in this country. In the 1959 budget for states, expenditure on *tattva-prachar* forms a good part of the total expenditure. We are however not achieving adequate results from this costly venture, and this is generally admitted even by many of those engaged in it. It is therefore necessary to reorganise and improve our *tattva-prachar* work in most places.

Gandhi never allowed during his lifetime any expenditure on propaganda in constructive work. He held that good and efficient work itself was the best propaganda. But Gandhi himself was our biggest broadcasting station for the propagation of dynamic ideas and programs. He did this not separately but as a part of his life and work. Without him we have now to undertake educative propaganda. The least we owe

1. *Tattva-prachar* is here used to mean the propagation of Gandhian ideas by communicative processes.

to him, however, in this regard is that our educative propaganda must be genuine, realistic and related to specific objectives and not merely academic and vague. It must go deeper and affect the character, conduct and life of the people.

Objectives

We, therefore, suggest the following objectives, which may be kept elastic and subject to necessary local variations :

(1) The clear understanding of non-violence as a practical working principle of daily life and for the solution of problems—personal, family, social, national and international. The test will be how from year to year our *satyagraha* work increases the number of adherents to non-violence.

(2) A deep understanding of the problems of social justice affecting the weaker, less-developed and suppressed sections of the human community. The test will be how many more people turn away from the evils of untouchability, casteism, communalism and racialism.

(3) The understanding of the economics of *kshadi* and village industries, etc. in terms of the realities of India and in terms of national planning. The test will be how many people increasingly adopt *kshadi* and use articles made by village craftsmen, like hand-pounded rice, ghani oil, palm jaggery, brown sugar, hand-made paper, etc. This will be the index of the wider acceptance of village-economy.

(4) The understanding of the need for individual and collective self-purification as the basis of building up a better society. The test will be more high-level conduct towards women and children, towards neighbours, etc. (Collective sanitation will be a good test of neighbourliness.)

(5) The understanding of Basic and Adult Education. In this case the test will be that more people accept Basic Education, support it and send their children to Basic Schools. The test for Adult Education will be better and more responsible citizenship.

(6) The understanding of the Gandhian teaching concerning *sarva-dharma-samamiti*. The test will be that more and more people are ready to give reverence to all the world religions and to avoid religious and communal conflicts and to promote common religious and communal

festivals, occasions, programmes, etc.

(7) The understanding of the cultural background of Gandhi's ideas and work. This means more and more people reading and understanding Ruskin, Tolstoy, Thoreau, the Sermon on the Mount, the Gita, the *Na Upanishad*, etc.

Organisational Set-Up

Every *Gedamand* Centre should also take up some *tatva-prachar* work in their respective rural areas. One of the *grāhasevaks* at each Centre should add this to his other work and there should be a small library, a good reading table and regular study classes at each Centre. Much can be explained orally without even knowledge of reading and writing. Thus we shall have as many rural *Tatva-prachar* Centres as *Gedamand* Centres in a state.

What will be called separate *Tatva-prachar* Centres would be in urban areas and classified as 'Major' and 'Sub' Centres. Major Centres should be only in big University and student places where there are the largest number of students and young people. The Sub Centres should be attached to Major Centres and within easy travelling distance of 10 to 20 miles or less, but not more.

There are many towns in every state with high schools and colleges. We cannot reach all of them with our limited resources in personnel and finance. We can, therefore, do nothing else but pick and choose the most suitable of them and only a few of them. Other towns will have to be left out. Therefore Major *Tatva-prachar* Centres in selected towns may be three to five in a state. We may then have two to four Sub-Centres round each Major Centre.

The main difference between a Major Centre and a Sub-Centre will be that we will have one or more full-time paid workers at a Major Centre and no full-time paid workers at all at a Sub-Centre. A Major Centre will have a good location, free or rented, at least 1000 books, a good reading table on which will be placed at least one local language paper and one English newspaper and some suitable magazines, regular study classes, lectures and discussions and appropriate cultural programs from time to time. But a Sub-Centre will get from the *Nidhi* only limited financial aid to buy books or pay part of the expenses of the Centre, which will be run by a local *sangha* or institution or person. A Major Centre may cost from Rs 2,000 to Rs 6,000 ordinarily per year, whereas a Sub-Centre will cost

only from Rs 100 to Rs 750 per year. Our workers at the Major Centres should keep in close touch with the workers and people in the Sub-Centres and enable them to participate from time to time in the activities of the Major Centres by a two-way traffic of cooperation and collaboration. Major and Sub-Centres will thus do *satva-pracār* in urban or semi-urban areas.

An overall State *Tatva-pracār* Organiser or Supervisor may not be necessary, just as there is hardly any Organiser or Supervisor for *Grām-mand Centres*. The *Saśralak* himself can inspect and supervise this work. If already there is an overall State Organiser or Supervisor for *satva-pracār* in any State, he should himself be in charge directly of one of the Major Centres and move about only occasionally, i.e. once in three months or so. A full-time State *Tatva-pracār* merely going up and down supervising other people's work will be a superfluity. Under the *Gāndhī Nidhi* we must not increase such administrative posts.

Every six months there should be some kind of an assessment in terms of objectives mentioned. For instance, a list may be kept of those who take to *Ahimsā* and articles of village industries, to Basic Schools, anti-untouchability and anti-caste pledges, etc.

Tatva-pracār Centres should promote the formation by others of *anghas* and associations to take up and spread *Gāndhīan* ideas on their own. This is a vast field of activity.

In places where we have no *Grām-mand Centres* or Urban *Tatva-pracār* Centres, Major or Subsidiary, short-term *satva-pracār* camps may be organised from time to time.

Conclusion

These are our ideas on the subject. We would request the *Saśralak* to carry on *satva-pracār* generally on these lines. The fundamental points may be kept intact even while alterations and amendments are made in details. One of the most important needs for a *Tatva-pracār* Centre will be some local *Adhyāp* or teacher or scholar and thinker who can, in an honorary capacity, guide study classes and discussions in a worthy manner. Even if a *Tatva-pracār* Centre has all the other facilities and advantages, it will be only an empty shell or a piece of disjointed activity without at least one such guide. The one thing never to be forgotten in this connection is that the explaining and spreading of *Gāndhīan* ideas should always remain close to realism, never dogmatic or fanatic, but quick and alive with the elasticity of truth which grows and develops in response to new challenges and situations.

20% discount on all

OUR PUBLICATIONS

during the month of January, 1939

REALISM, ROMANTICISM AND REVOLUTION :

TWO VOLUMES	By M. N. Roy	Rs. 12 30
MATERIALISM	By M. N. Roy	" 7 30
EXPLORATIONS	.. Subhaschandra Ray	" 4/-
CRIME AND KARMA I CATS AND WOMEN	.. M. N. Roy	" 7 30
THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION	.. M. N. Roy	" 18/-
REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN CHINA	.. M. N. Roy	" 15/-
INDIA'S MESSAGE	.. M. N. Roy	" 6/-
NEW HUMANISM	.. M. N. Roy	" 2 30
SCIENTIFIC POLITICS	.. M. N. Roy	" 5 30
NEW ORIENTATION	.. M. N. Roy	" 6/-
IN MAN'S OWN IMAGE	.. Ellen Key & Subhaschandra Ray	" 5 50
RADICALISM	.. Subhaschandra Ray	" 2 30
HISTORICAL ROLE OF ISLAM	.. M. N. Roy	" 3 00

AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS.

All orders must be placed by January, 1939 Postage extra

RENAISSANCE PUBLISHERS (Private) LTD.

15, Bankim Chatterjee Street, Calcutta-12

Indian Journal Of Adult Education

(A Quarterly Journal)

Gandhi Jayanti Number

CONTENTS

P. G. Shah	Caste and Social Education
J. B. Dabara	Gayatri-Bandhan or Caste Barriers
Charles Mudge	Caste and Community in India and Thailand
Paul Legrand	Adult Education
B. H. Mehta	Towards a Casteless Rural Community
M. C. Namavally	Casteism and Social Education

Rs. 5 (Rs. 00; 14s.) a year (March-June-Sep.-Dec.)

The Indian Adult Education Association

32, Park Road, Delhi.

THE INDIAN ECONOMIC REVIEW

The Journal of The Delhi School of Economics

Edited by

V.K.R.V. Rao and B.N. Gangoli

I. Articles		Page
A Growth Equation Analysis of the Russian and Marginal Theories of Growth	William O. Tinsley	1
Mores Egypte Læta, Writas	H K. Maheshwar Singh	6
Investment and Efficiency in Indian Railways during the Second Five Year Plan	Suresh Ch. Patel	18
The Indian Labour Market and its Impact on Patterns of Regional Wage Differentials	M. Laxmi Narayan	35
A Method for Estimating Decade Interval Migration in Cities from Indian Census Data	S.N. Agarwala	59
II. Reviews		
III. Notes and Memoranda		
Economic Relations between Countries of Different Systems	Tadatoshi Uchida	104
A Note on the Concentration of Control in the Manufacturing Industry	J.M. Pridley	120

Price Rs. 4 or 5 Shillings net for a single copy

Annual Subscription Rs. 18 or 15 Shillings net

Editorial Correspondence, Books and Periodicals for review and communications respecting Advertisements are to be sent to the

Editor, the Indian Economic Review,

The Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, Delhi-2, INDIA

To UNDERSTAND New India and to follow how its agriculture-based planned economy is shaping, you can do no better than read *The Economic Weekly* regularly.

Established in 1949, on the eve of India's five-year Plan, *The Economic Weekly* reflects the spirit of a nation in the making, while faithfully portraying the changing political and economic scene from week to week. It is independent, analytical and factual; an ideal guide for those who want to keep abreast of developments in this part of the world.

Brief, lively and compact, the paper manages to give a surprisingly wide coverage within a small compass. Those who are interested in problems of economic planning in an under developed country and serious students of India's economic problems in particular will find this paper extremely useful.

"Over the past three years a remarkable series of articles has been appearing in that enterprising periodical, the Bombay published *Economic World*. These have given preliminary accounts of no less than fifteen Village Studies by British, American and Indian anthropologists and sociologists" - *New Surveys and Notes*, April 9, 1950

Editor: Sushen Chaudhary

Business Manager: A. Fernandes

Yearly Subscription Rs 24/- Foreign 45/- or 36/-

THE ECONOMIC WEEKLY

104, Apollo St. apt. BOMBAY 1.

Founded by Rabindranath Tagore

VISVABHARATI QUARTERLY

Old Series 1923-31 New Series from 1935

India's leading journal of general cultural interest

Editor: KSHITIS ROY

Volume 34

Number 1

Summer 1953

ARTICLES

Dushan Zhandar Winternitz and Tagore

Abanindranath Chandra Bose (Tr.) Hymn to the Earth

Atharva Veda XII 1

M. Majumdar Maulana Abul Kalam Azad

Georg Franz Giese Guy De Maupassant

Georg Gurdajani Is a Dog Really Human

Prabodh Chandra Sen Kazi Nazimul Islam, The Muslim part of Bengal
Book Reviews

ILLUSTRATIONS

Photograph: Mount Winternitz

Photograph: Maulana Abul Kalam Azad

Contributions, Exchange journals, Books for Review, Advertisement Material and Annual Subscription of Rs. 3.00,
14 shillings or 3 dollars to be sent to:

The Editor, VISVABHARATI QUARTERLY,
Sankhachakr Post, West Bengal, India.

Indian Journal of Adult Education

Vol. XIX

October 1955

No. 3

GANDHI JAYANTI NUMBER

ON

Caste, Untouchability and Social Education

Shri P.G. Shah

Dr. Jai. P. Bulsara

Prof. Charles Madge

Prof. A.R. Wadia

Shri Jagjivan Ram

Acharya Kaka Kalelkar

Dr. B.H. Mehta

Shri H.C. Naraswamy

Annual subscription: Rs. 5/- ; Lock issue: Rs. 1.25 ap

Can be had of :-

Indian Adult Education Association

39-Palaz Bazar, DELHI

Some Articles Of Interest From Back Numbers Of Gandhi Marg

January 1957

Honore Alexander
Margaret Barr
Kakasabai Kajlikar

Gandhi and Resistance for All Faiths
Gandhi's Way in Religious Education
Gandhi and the Language Question

April 1957

R.C. Zaehner
Bharatan Karmurappa
Wilfred Wellock

Religions and the Challenge of Materialism
The Roots of Gandhi's Religion
Why Village Republics?

July 1957

John S. Hoyland
W.E.B. Du Bois
Lord Birdwood

Mahatma Gandhi and the War on War
Gandhi and the American Negroes
Gandhi and Communism—a Speculation

October 1957

B. R. Doshi
S.G. Bhaye
P.T. Raja

Gandhian Non-violence : a Landmark
Satyagraha and Democracy
The Four Basic Principles of Gandhi's
Philosophy

January 1958

S. Radhakrishnan
U.N. Dicker
Gyan Chaud

A Divided Inheritance
Bhutan and the Socialist Pattern of Society
Bhutan as a Social Revolution

April 1958

V.M. Bedekar
Homer A. Jack
Richard B. Gregg

Ahimsa in the Mahabharata—and Gandhi
Gandhi and the Communists
A Peasant's Five-Year Plan

July 1958

B. Natanson
J. Vijayaranga
B.G. Gokhale

Gandhi and Thoreau
Gandhi—a Man Alone
Gandhians and Socialism

October 1958

Vinoba Bhave
Reginald Reynolds
Euse Wynne-Tyson

The Standfast Wisdom
Jack Hoyland—an English follower of Gandhi
The True Significance of Gandhi

Copies of some of these numbers still available

G A N D H I M A R G

Bagmati New Delhi-1

Gandhi Marg

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF GANDHIAN THOUGHT

*There is no such thing as Gandhism
and I do not want to leave any sect after me.*

VOLUME THREE NUMBER TWO APRIL 1987

GANDHI MARG
Statement of ownership and other particulars
FORM IV

Place of Publication	New Delhi
Periodicity of Publication	Quarterly
Printer's Name	T. K. Mahadevan
Nationality	Indian
Address	Raghat, New Delhi
Publisher's Name	T. K. Mahadevan
Nationality	Indian
Address	Raghat, New Delhi
Editor's Name	G. Ramachandran
Nationality	Indian
Address	Raghat, New Delhi
Names and addresses of individuals who own the newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one per cent. of the total capital	The journal is owned by the Gandhi Secretariat, Delhi, Raghat, New Delhi

I, T. K. Mahadevan, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief

Dated 15 April 1958

Sd T. K. Mahadevan
Publisher

JOURNALS OF ALL INDIA RADIO

● **AKASHVANI**
(*English*)

● **SARANG**
(*Hindi*)

● **AWAZ**
(*Urdu*)

*For Planned Listening
and Good Reading*

Concession to Direct Subscribers

Liberal Terms for Agents

Enquiries from — The Editor,

Akashvani (Indian Listener),
Akashvani Bhawan,
NEW DELHI-1

Gandhi Marg

Editor

G. RAMACHANDRAN

VOLUME THREE

NUMBER TWO

APRIL 1976

GANDHI SMARAK NIDHI

RAJGHAT NEW DELHI

EDITORIAL BOARD

R. R. DIWAKAR

J. B. KRIPALANI

JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM

SUREMAN NARAYAN

SADIQ ALI

G. RAMACHANDRAN

PUBLISHER

T. K. MAHADEVAN

Rs 1.00 a year in South Asia; Rs. or \$2.00 elsewhere, postfree.

Rs 1.50 (Rs. or 75s.) the copy. Payment in advance

*Published by T.K. Mahadevan for the Gandhi Smarak Niket, Rajghat, New Delhi, and
printed by him at the Newshema Press Private Limited (Successors of Arjun Press) Delhi.*

Contents

	Editorial Notes 75
Vinoba Bhave	The Steadfast Wisdom 76
Hiren Mukerjee	Gandhi and the Communist Party 83
Homer A. Jack	Gandhism and the Ghana Conference 90
Ethel Mannin	To Live in Mankind—A Memoir of Reginald Reynolds 95
Esme Wynne-Tyson	Gandhi as a Seer and Prophet 100
Geoff Sharp	Britain Considers Her Weapons—A Record of a Debate 104
	The Importance of Vows: A Correspondence 127
Ananda Sukhar Ray	Some Gandhian Reflections 132
N.R. Maheshi	Whither Higher Education ? 136
Mahadeva N. Pandita	Devotional Aids Dear to Gandhi 141
	Letters to the Editor 145
	Book Reviews 150

Contributors to this Number

Vinod Bhave. This is the third chapter of his forthcoming book on the G.M. concept of *satyagraha*. The first two chapters appeared in *Gandhi Mārg* (October 1958 and January 1959).

Homer A. Jack: American writer, Editor of the anthology, *The Gandhi Reader* (1956), published both in the United States and in Britain. Was a fraternal delegate to the All-African People's Conference from the American Committee on Africa.

N.R. Malhotra: A former professor of economics; worked for several years under Gandhi on the Constructive Program, now a member of the Indian parliament. Has written before in *Gandhi Mārg* (October 1957 and October 1958).

Ethel Mann: The well-known English writer and novelist. Wife of the lately deceased Reginald Reynolds. A frequent contributor to *Gandhi Mārg*.

Hema Mukherjee: Well-known Indian Communist leader, now a

member of the Indian parliament. Author of, among others, *An Introduction to Socialism* (1939) *Indian Struggles for Freedom* (1944) and, recently, *Gandhiji: A Study* (1958).

Mahendra N. Pandey: Teacher at Gandhi College, Navsari (India).

Anand Sankar Ray: Eminent Bengali novelist and writer.

Gene Sharp. Author of several studies of Gandhi and non-violence. Was Assistant Editor of *Peace News* (London) before he took up research at the Institute for Social Research, Oslo, where he is now working on 'Totalitarianism and Non-violent Resistance'. His thesis in sociology at the Ohio State University was on the subject of non-violence.

Fane Wynne-Tyson: English writer. Author of *Atticus, the Fellow in the Cap* (1951), a study of the historical relationship between Christianity and Islamism. Is a frequent contributor on Gandhi themes and has written before in *Gandhi Mārg* (October 1958).

Editorial Notes

The Gandhi Peace Foundation

The project of the Gandhi Peace Foundation has advanced one step further since the publication of the Statement, in our January number, embodying the objectives and functions of the Foundation with relevant elucidations. The Committee of the Foundation has drawn up and adopted an elastic and simple Outline Constitution to fulfil the objectives and carry out the functions as set forth in the Statement. The language and wording of the Constitution are now being touched up and it will be published in its final form within two or three weeks. Its full text will appear in our next number.

Some of the salient features of the Constitution may, however, be indicated at once. The Constitution provides for four categories of members : Foundation Members, who will constitute the Governing Body in charge of policies and administration ; Foundation Fellows, from among whom will be set up the Research Council ; Associate Members, who will form the broad base of the Foundation ; and Life Members, to be enrolled later as the Foundation grows and develops.

It has also been decided that the Foundation will be an International Association with Headquarters in New Delhi and that a nucleus of Research and Studies should be started without delay by utilising the Gandhi National Memorial Museum with its Library in New Delhi.

The Governing Body of the Foundation will have as its Chairman Sri R.R. Diwaker, who is also the Chairman of the Gandhi Smarak

Nidhi) and Śrī. G. Rāmachandran, the Secretary of the Nidhi, will be its Member-Secretary.

Our readers will no doubt look out for the full text of the Constitution in the next issue of *Gāndhī Māj*.

The Sarvodaya Sammelan at Ajmer

The All-India Sarvodaya Sammelan is the annual conference of Gāndhīan constructive workers, at which they come together in the presence of Mahāṣi Vinobā. This year the Sammelan assembled in Ajmer, in Rājasthān, in the last week of February. The number of delegates was about 7,000 and the number of those who attended was perhaps more than 30,000.

The most remarkable feature of the Sammelan was that such a vast number of people came together for three days consecutively to give careful thought and attention to non-political and social and moral issues of the highest importance in the India of today. There was astonishing discipline and voluntary good conduct among the big crowds at the Sammelan. The attendance of village women was perhaps larger than at any conference in recent times in India. Mahāṣi Vinobā was the luminous focus of reverential attention and every time he spoke he touched the intellect of the people as much as their hearts. The Sammelan was also a great congress of Indian youth, because younger people took vital and important part in all the deliberations.

The major issue before the Sammelan was the *Śānti-Senā*, or the Peace Army. Nearly a thousand *Śānti-Senā*s, or Peace Soldiers, participated in an impressive and disciplined rally and marched nearly ten miles with the Mahāṣi as he left Ajmer on his walking pilgrimage at the end of the Conference. The Ajmer Sarvodaya Sammelan may well go down in history as the big starting point of the *Śānti-Senā* in India.

The attendance of nearly 7,000 Gāndhīan workers and nearly 30,000 visitors, the active leadership of youth, the innumerable group meetings discussing the programs of *Śānti-Senā* and *Gramādā* and above all the supremely gentle but dynamic presence of Mahāṣi Vinobā combined to strengthen the roots and fibres of Gāndhī's life and teachings in the hearts of the people as nothing else in India since the passing away of the Master.

Henry S.L. Polak

Soon after Reginald Reynolds, Henry S.L. Polak has now passed away. Polak was one of the closest and life-long friends of Mahatma Gandhi. Among those who stood by Gandhi in the satyagraha movement in South Africa, Polak was one of the bravest and most loyal. Gandhi himself wrote about him: 'Mr Polak's candour drew me to him. We got to know each other. We seemed to hold closely similar views on the essential things of life. He liked the simple life. He had a wonderful faculty of translating into practice anything that appealed to his intellect.'

Innumerable hearts in India will go out to Mrs Mills Polak, the brave and good woman who valiantly helped her husband to remain true to non-violence throughout his life. She will be long remembered also as the author of one of the finest little books on Gandhi—*My Gandhi, the Man*, published in 1931.

We have now lost another outstanding English collaborator of Gandhi. India will long cherish the memory of Polak. The best tribute we can pay to his memory is to strengthen the links of goodwill and understanding between India and England.

The Steadfast Wisdom

W. J. G. M. Meesters, *Ph.D., is an associate professor of international trade and finance at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. He is also a senior research fellow at the Centre for Economic Policy Research, London, and a senior research advisor at the Netherlands Bureau of Economic Policy Analysis. His research interests include international trade, international finance, and international macroeconomics. He has published numerous articles in leading journals in these fields. He is also co-author of the book "International Trade and Finance: A Modern Approach" (Cambridge University Press, 2005). He is currently working on a book on "International Trade and Finance: A Modern Approach" (Cambridge University Press, 2005).*

The meaning of the Steadfast Window has been fully explained.⁸ In the three verses which follow a persuasive description of its impressions is given. In the first verse the description is metaphorical.

Daphne genkwa var. *genkwa* (L.) Thunb.
Daphne genkwa var. *genkwa* (L.) Thunb.

A person is described as possessing a steady mind when sorrow does not disturb him nor happiness elate him, who neither fears nor hates anything he does not like.

The pivotal word 'agrar' is present here also, but no comment is called for as the interpretation has already been given. We have been told of the need to root out all desires. This is not an easy thing to do. Therefore the verse speaks of the less difficult attributes of the Broadheart Wisdom. One should not allow the heart to be perturbed by unpleasantness and sorrow. To be perturbed means to be frightened, to be irritated or to be overcome with anxiety. This meaning is inherent in the word, *advaga* 'ar' means 'up' and 'vaga' means 'movement'. One should avoid the plight of coen going uphill, the straining, the suffering. Sorrow must be borne with patience. It must not force us to our knees. Joy, like grief, must be faced cautiously. Men do not want grief to come to them nor do they forget themselves easily when it is upon them. It can be borne with patience. But men do want happiness. When they are happy they easily forget themselves. Therefore happiness is dangerous. The craving for happiness is the result of an erroneous idea of happiness. It is wise to carefully restrain the heart when happiness comes. Patience is demanded at the approach of sorrow, restraint at the approach of happiness. One

1. Transferred from the original Hatch Box 1.000.000.

3. *New Communist Action*, January 1958, pp. 16-17.

man check oneself to avoid entanglement. When an on goes uphill it begins to run. Our feelings tend to run in a similar fashion when we are happy. And they must be held back for the same reason. This is not too difficult. It is easy compared to the rooting out of desire entirely. Here we are referring to desire in both its aspects, the aspect which yearns for happiness and the aspect which shuns unhappiness. Both must be controlled.

Desire has two aspects and three consequences: hunger, anger, and fear. Hunger arises from attachment, the feeling of dependence, of reciprocation. Anger arises from the feeling of deprivation, of antagonism, enforced detachment. Fear is a part of anger, being intensified sensation. There is a very special attachment, the attachment to life itself, the desire to live. This desire is strongly rooted in our hearts. Fear and anger are therefore thought of as separate emotions. Fear is born when our desire to live is assailed. This is a feeling that is instinctive in all creatures. When life is threatened with destruction it awakens. Unjust and tyrannical people take advantage of this feeling in many ways. They terrify men to make them slaves. The prop of their power is this fear; it is more effective than cannon and guns and other weapons of war. Therefore it is necessary to make a special, separate effort, to undertake a specific attack, to eliminate this fear just as a special, separate effort is required to eliminate hunger and anger. When these three, hunger, anger and fear, have been destroyed, wisdom can grow steady and become stable. These emotions attack the intelligence, the *buddhi*, and disturb it. It is for this reason that we are advised to do away with them. The psychological attributes of the Steadfast Wisdom are thus described in this verse. In the verse which follows we are told the manner in which self-restraint can actually be practiced in our work, *dhyaana yoga*.

[illegible]

His mind is steady who is free of attachment, who is not pleasantly excited by advantageous gains nor moved to hatred by disadvantageous losses. The feelings should not be allowed to cling to anything. Do not set your heart on anything. Do not let it fasten itself on anything or build for itself a home. A man's heart is usually set on something. For one it will be books, for another agriculture. In the preceding verse we are admonished not to grieve when losses come to us nor to exult over our gains. In this verse an easier method is shown to us. We have not been told not to take pleasure in happiness. We have only been told not to let it overwhelm us to the point of self-forgetfulness, not to exult in it, not to congratulate ourselves overmuch. Take pleasure in happiness by all means but do not

clap your hands and shout aloud. It is nice when a child is born. Be pleased but do not distribute sweetmeats. It is nice to get married. There is no objection whatsoever. But do not engage a band. Is there no more than this here? Similarly one feels badly when bad things happen. There is nothing wrong in that. Feel badly. But do not give way to remorse or grief. Do not allow it to affect your mind. Deep emotional disturbance often leaves its mark on the mind. The mind must be kept secure, the intelligence unobstructed. Chinmaya said, 'If I must lose everything I shall accept the loss. But let my mind remain unaffected.' It is thus that a *homo sapiens* conducts himself in practical affairs. Nor is it difficult to do this if there is any depth at all to the feelings. No effort to control a man's feelings will be of any avail whatsoever if they are no deeper than a monkey's. Monkeys chatter when they are happy and grind their teeth when they are angry. Let us not be like them. If your feelings are at all deep this method of controlling them will not be difficult.

To make the idea of control more explicit the example of a tortoise is cited in the next verse.

*Yadi sarikarate apyase kharadipadma sarvadai,
Indriyai indriyarthabhyase tasya prajñā pratipattiḥ.*

As a tortoise draws his limbs within his shell at the first sign of danger, man protects the tranquility of his mind by withdrawing his senses from worldly objects.

Pull your senses away from worldly things the way a tortoise pulls its appendages into its shell at the first indication of danger. At other times it puts them out and moves about. A man also, when he finds himself in a dangerous situation, should withdraw into himself and thus shield his senses. At other times, when they can be used to his benefit, he can release his senses and let them move about. This method is an even easier one. Come away from a place that seems dangerous to you. Let your senses range freely when there is no apprehension of danger. What can be simpler? Even an animal understands it. That is why a tortoise is chosen to illustrate it. The Gītā argues that if even a creature like the tortoise can protect itself in that manner can a man not do so.

As here described this appears easy but it is, for us, difficult. It depends upon habit formation. If a small child is trained in this way from the beginning the teaching of the Gītā becomes a part of his nature, a part of him. It is merely a matter of habit. Some think that the teaching of the Gītā goes against nature. That is not at all the case. The natural inclinations of a small child are pure. We force him to develop a liking for many things

by making him sample them. We inoculate in him artificial and unnatural tastes. Things which are naturally pleasing to a small child are to be preferred, says the Gñā. Do them. We spoil the tastes of children by giving them wrong training from the beginning. This has to be corrected later by contradictory instruction. It seems difficult to control our senses only because they have been corrupted in the first instance by bad teaching. If good habits are formed from the start the regulation of our senses becomes easy. 'The nature of my senses is such', writes Jñānadeva, 'that my eyes do not turn to see what should not be seen, nor my ears turn to hear what should not be heard'. Why should this seem difficult? If I see a fire burning must I put my hand in it? If, for any reason, it becomes necessary for me to put my hand in it I shall think a long time about doing so first and prepare myself. When we know for certain where danger lies our senses refuse to approach it of their own accord. Normally it should appear very difficult to make our senses move about freely in a dangerous place. Bad instruction has given rise to the opposite state of affairs. The unnatural and difficult seem to us simple and natural. What can the Gñā do about it? The Gñā has shown us a way which, from its point of view, is easy even for a child to follow. There can be no doubt that, given normal and natural social conditions, the conquest of the senses within its fold ought not to be difficult.

Two methods of sense control are commonly recommended, restraint or sublimation and repression or suppression. Let us consider both of them. The senses can be suppressed only for short periods of time. To master them requires a lifelong effort, a discipline comprising the whole of life. Suppose, for instance, I like to eat sweets. It is not wrong to eat sweets. But to indulge my craving to excess is bad. Therefore I stop eating them entirely for a time. The need for my doing so is the need to establish a habit, to form my own nature in a way that will enable me to control my own tastes. To establish my control, to assert my mastery, I suppress my senses for a time. It is not a sin to eat sweets. It may even, in a certain state of health, become necessary to eat them. But in order to maintain my control over my pleasure in eating sweets I discontinue eating them totally for a time. Afterwards I resume eating them but cautiously, in due measure. This is what I mean by self-control. Another example is silence. Silence is adopted for a fixed length of time in order to facilitate sadhana. Sweet speech is a permanent device. Similarly, fasting is an occasional practice while moderate eating is a permanent one. People can be judged from these things. A Gujarati proverb runs, 'Men are tested at the dining table and in bed'. All the weaknesses of human nature are revealed when men sit down to dine or take to bed with some illness. It is easier to overeat and

even to fast than it is for men to habitually limit the amount of food they take. They prefer the extremes to the formation of the habit of moderation. The formation of the habit of moderation is more difficult for them than taking the consequences of going to extremes. Self-control means holding the senses to the way of moderation. In order to maintain that control the senses have, on occasion, to be forced to the extreme of repression. The value of repression is obvious but it is not something that is practiced daily.

Repression is occasional and control permanent. The difference between the two which we have pointed out here is a difference of degree, of intensity, resulting from an inner condition. Viewed objectively it will be seen that repression, like control, can have a permanent effect. Fasting is, as we have said, occasional while moderate eating is a daily habit. But suppose a person develops the habit of having his meals at a fixed time every day. Such a habit is beneficial. He will not eat anything offered to him at any other time. This is repression but, obviously, it is a permanent, not an occasional, condition. The same is true with regard to silence. Ordinarily silence is a temporary condition but occasions to withhold speech, repress the urge to say something, occur daily. Not to say what we feel like saying, not to give the answer we wish to give, to people who speak to us is often necessary. We are, in fact, forced to practise both control and repression every single day. The difference between them, therefore, is merely a difference of degree. They are actually the same. They have a common factor—the discipline of the self. Once this difference, the difference between control and repression, is understood we can forget it. But the word for repression, 'apavāda', needs further elucidation. There is no suggestion of compulsion in it, is there? One suspects there is. But the phrase 'suppression of the senses' was not intended to mean compulsion. Meaning does not adhere unalterably to a word. Many derive their meaning from the manner in which they are used.

The description of the chief characteristics of the Steadfast Wisdom and its three subsidiary attributes is now complete. In the following verses the simplest means of controlling the senses is explained in greater detail. The Gītā considers this control so important that it refers to it again and again. The theological and scientific aspects of the treatise both be discussed in detail. Science answers the interrogative 'How?' and theology answers the interrogative 'Why?'. How we can master our senses and why we should do so, that is to say, in what manner this mastery is related to the Steadfast Wisdom we shall consider in the next issue.

Gandhi and the Communist Party

HIREN MUKERJEE

The title of this article, which is being written at the editor's kind request,¹ is perhaps a little misleading. The Communist Party has nothing so crude as a 'line' on Gandhi, though of course it has, from time to time, made its own evaluation of his policies and programs, and Communists, generally speaking, have a common understanding of his role in our history. These lines are being written by one who was at one time very nearly a Gandhi devotee but broke away when he found in Communism, rightly or wrongly, the only real answer to society's ills.

Since the personal equation cannot be entirely discounted, there must be a difference in the response to Gandhi's life and work as between those in the Communist Party (or in other political organisations) who have experienced the exhilarations and disillusionments of the Gandhi era and those who have not. Even so, Gandhi spanned so magnificently a whole historical epoch that, at a time of acute political controversy, Indian Communists in the early 'forties did not hesitate to hail him as the 'Father of the Nation'. Basic differences notwithstanding, we study him, critically but with reverence, and while we cannot accept some of the solemn claptrap uttered about him and his achievement, we cherish him as the man who, more than any other, rooted himself, so to speak, in the life of his people and changed the very air of Indian politics.

Even before there was a properly organised and effective Communist Party in India, Gandhi had come to be the leader, and the symbol of

1. This is the first of a series of articles on the theme of 'Gandhi and the Political Future of India', which *Gandhi Marg* will publish in successive numbers during the current year.—Editor.

India's struggle for freedom. The Soviet Revolution of 1917, however, had affected strongly the climate of world politics, and in spite of India's reactionaries and Britain's policemen, the ideas of Communism were growing, inevitably, out of conditions in the country. This was by no means unknown to Gandhi: a Communist document circulated at the Ahmedabad session of the Congress (December 1921) called for a movement 'backed by the irresistible strength of the entire population consciously fighting for their material interests'.¹ Like the character in *Moloch*, doubters inadvertently, who wanted to embrace a rival in order to be the better able to crush him, Gandhi often in his career spoke of being a better socialist or Communist than those who wore the label. Perhaps it will be fairer to say that Gandhi made an honest effort, first with his heart and later—when in jail, at an advanced age, he read Marx's *Capital*—also with his head, to find out the truth about this, to him, new-fangled but world-shattering idea. He met and talked to Communists, and found in them and their notions some attractive traits but more that were repellent. He even sometimes thought of Communists in terms of 'red run'.² This was not, of course, all that he thought and saw of Communism, but the observation was not untypical of his mind. Several recent articles in *Gandhi Mārg*, by people no dispirited as Lord Birdwood and Homer A. Jack, have indeed sought, with an undecorous of rejecting, to stress this thing.

It should, therefore, occasion no surprise that Indian Communists from time to time have reacted sharply and very critically to Gandhi's thought, and even more, his action. Once even Jawaharlal Nehru wondered at the 'extraordinary paradox' of Gandhi, 'with all his passion for non-violence', favouring 'a political and social structure which is wholly based on violence and coercion'.³

If Communists have sometimes, as is alleged, been impolite, and if their words and deeds were seldom free from exaggeration and eccentricities, surely it is part of fairness to recognise what does not require much psychological insight to understand, namely, that they were driven by the venomous hostility they encountered almost everywhere into a posture of crusading militancy which naturally gave rise to certain aberrations. It is a pity, though not a surprise to Communists, that it is precisely the so-called Gandhians who often betray a lack of the capacity for such fairness.

With some of us, our respect for Gandhi is deeper than most

1. Quoted in R. Palme Dutt, *India Today*, Bombay, 1947, pp. 242-44.

2. *Morgen*, January 1948.

3. Jawaharlal Nehru, *Towards Freedom*, New York, 1941, pp. 218-19.

Gandhians can imagine, but in spite of all that respect, there are chains that separate us from the great man—chains that are sheer dishonesty to hide. It is neither perversity nor an immoral (or amoral) predilection for strife and violence that makes us see in social evolution the conflict of classes—a fact of life which we did not invent and surely do not relish. Gandhi's thought presupposes, however, on the basis of no known evidence or credible social prognostication, the possibility of a *Rama Rajya*, where there is, by some miracle, an 'automatic equilibrium' of all discordant interests. We are often stigmatised as un-Indian because we hold, not as a faith but on an analysis of facts, that industrialisation is new, as it has always been, the one hope of the masses who everywhere in the wide world are still poor. This is not to say that everything is right with industrial society as we know it: on the contrary, much of it is wrong and must be set right. But we aver—and this is as absolute an avowal as can be—that we must not dream ourselves into the myth of a *Rama Rajya* which never existed. Except in lucky pockets, so to speak, the living conditions of the human race down to our own times have been nearly unpeakable; they are so still with two-thirds of the world. Gandhi, however, thought that a lower level of national well-being was a necessary prerequisite for a higher standard of spiritual living. 'Every time I get into a railway train or use a motor', he wrote in *Red Shanty*, whose formulations were never repudiated or even intelligibly modified, 'I know I am doing violence to my sense of what is right'. And so he came to speak of 'cottage industries', 'honest labour' (which everyone must practise) and 'natural cure' as essential items in his program for the people. Sometimes in his conduct he seemed to relent in his view, but he never agreed that the merits of machine civilisation far outweighed its defects and that it was neither right nor feasible to have a throw-back to the pre-industrial age. And so people claiming to be legacies of his thought, like Vinobá Bhave and Jayaprakāśh Nārāyaṇ, speak of a higher standard of living as a new fetish and recall, as Nārāyaṇ did before an international audience in Rangoon, that our aim is 'deliverance, whether we call it *moksha* or *mokpa*—deliverance from the limitations of time and space, from the limitations of life and death, from bondage'. It sounds, no doubt, vaguely magnificent, but in terms of our people's problems, which no mere glimpses of a higher morality can resolve, rather hollow and deceptive too.

If Gandhi was no more than a mere thinker who dreamt dreams and saw visions, there would have been no reason for us to join issue with his ideas. He would in that case have been remembered, with love and re-

1 T. K. Upadhyay, *Gandhi and Free India* (Bombay, 1956), p. 232.

port, as another of those beautiful and ineffectual angels who are fallen from time to time amongst men. But he was a maker of men and of events—a stupendous individual, of the Indian earth, earthy, and with extraordinary reserves of strength and character. Even so, the Communists affirmed, he was not, for he could not be, above class and indifferent to class interests in society; he was not working, even as the protagonist of the moral concept of non-violence, in a social vacuum. He had his class links, and an outlook which could not transcend the class limitations he had taken for granted. And so it appeared to Communists that while it must be silly to assert (as we sometimes in our zeal and ignorance perhaps did) that Gandhi acted as the conscious and willing tool of the bourgeoisie, it would be fatuous to ignore the vital fact that over and over again in his career, what Gandhi with his stress on 'the beauty of compromise' wanted—namely, an honourable settlement in the struggle with the British, which would satisfy some of the country's hopes and keep off intemperate popular outbursts—conceded with the desire of the bourgeoisie for a limited effort, for limited economic and political gains, and even more, for avoidance of all possibility of revolution with its ineliminable socio-economic consequences. Over and over again it was seen that the bourgeoisie, including its 'moderate' sections who fought shy even of the Congress, knew that Gandhi alone could ride the storm of popular convulsion which they themselves were pitifully incapable of controlling. From Chauri-Chauri (1922) when he called off a developing struggle, to the mutiny in the 'Royal Indian Navy' (1946), it was found, over and over again, that it was he alone, with his incomparable standing with the masses, his selflessness and sobriety of character, his unswerving possession of the key, which timorous politicians never had, to the people's hearts, who could avert revolution, and yet, basing himself on the strength derived from the masses, drive a successful bargain with imperialism.

Renan once said that when Fate could not destroy a great man it sent him disciples in revenge. Reproting by rote words like 'truth' and 'non-violence', whose real majesty they too often violate, they seek generally to capitalise for their own gain Gandhi's credit for having achieved, virtually alone and by his own patented methods, the independence of India. This ascription alone to Gandhi and his movement of credit for Indian freedom is, if the truth is to be told, nearly unmitigated mendacity. In India's house there are many mansions, and in our national movement there have been many strands. No one man in the history of India struggling to be free has played as large a part as Mahatma Gandhi, but he did not work on virgin soil and he did not work alone. This is not the place to recount the landmarks of that struggle, a struggle in which, at one end, people who never swore by non-violence, like revolutionary

'terrorists' and the war-torn 'Indian National Army', and at the other end, the working people in factories and fields, have played a prominent and often independent (of Gandhi and Gandhism) role. Indeed, it might quite plausibly be argued that the history of our struggle for freedom repeatedly shows that the people's deviations from the rigid rails of satyagraha, rather than satyagraha itself, put fear in the alien administration and, at a certain stage, made its continuance impossible. This is not to deny the proved role of satyagraha (and this is Gandhi's unique contribution) as a massive mobilising factor in patriotic endeavour; but to claim satyagraha's exclusive potency in the fight for India's freedom is unrealistic and untrue.

In spite of Gandhi, so whom the independence which came in August 1947 brought so glow in the heart, his disciples have claimed credit for Gandhi and for Britain, the generous giver, for the achievement of independence 'with such little bloodshed and violence'. That India had not to pay much of a price for her freedom is, however, a myth, however sedulously it might be propagated. Apart from our martyrs, unadded to non-violence, the process of the transfer of power to deliberately divided India implied, before and after the event, and as an inevitable concomitant thereof, an amount of human suffering which, in quantity or in quality, is hardly less than the suffering involved in perhaps any of history's great revolutions. The second thing to remember is that, unlike as in such revolutions, the suffering borne by the people of India and Pakistan, before and after the constitution of the two States, was at bottom senseless and no spur at all to great endeavour. It was a form of massive suffering which numbs body and soul and does not release, in the very suffering of it, heightening qualities of character. It was as if we purchased our partitioned freedom with coin that was ethically counter-fert, and so it is that even yet our people do not feel sufficiently the glow of that freedom. The manner in which we won our freedom—and it saddened, most of all, the great Gandhi—has left an unwanted stamp on all that has followed so far.

Communists, however, must not be thought of as belittling Gandhi's achievements, both in regard to the country's freedom and to tasks of social reconstruction. Ours is a hoary country, our problems are enormous and complicated, social and religious complexes constitute a backlog of history that cannot be easily cleared. And Gandhi was at the same time conservative as well as revolutionary. Often he stopped short, perhaps because he was supremely preoccupied with the problem of avoiding violence.⁴

4. *Ibid.*, *passim*.

One might now turn to the preceding issue of 'ends and means',¹ it being assumed that Communists care only for the ends and are readily unscrupulous about means, while Gandhi lays stress only on the means which being right are bound to lead to the right results. The position, however, is not so simple as it is here posed. It is certainly conceded by Communists that the problem of means is a very serious matter, that much avoidable suffering and failure has been caused, especially during and after revolutions, by lack of proper care for it, that our whole attention might be given to finding the most immediately effective means with the result that, the ends being distant, the means might themselves turn out to be such as would damage or even wreck the ends originally sought. Communists, however, are sure that the tasks of revolution are not, and cannot be, of such a nature that in performing them one has to strip oneself of moral scruple; on the contrary, they demand what is in reality moral conduct. But they believe, on the evidence of social history, that there is no fool-proof moral road, that one must choose a course of action which would, on balance, produce more good than evil, and that a moral choice of this kind, difficult no doubt, has got to be made. Communists recall that while it is surely a good rule not to inflict pain, sometimes serious operations involving suffering become necessary and desirable. Wars are not happy things and they are certainly painful—but they have been fought for just causes also, as in the case of the wars of liberation, which have not ended yet, as Algeria testifies. Revolutions have meant suffering and 'terror', but in the classic instances of 1789 and 1917 and 1949, they show how even 'terror', by no means a pleasant thing in itself, has been, in certain special contexts, necessary in the interests of humanity and to that extent just. Gandhi claimed to be consistent over the 'ends and means' issue, but he often failed to justify himself. To Jews under the heel of Hitler and to Czechoslovakia overrun by fascist forces he gave advice—non-resistance—which proved to be a waste of breath. Even his faithful friend, Kallenbach, himself a German Jew, could not accept the position which Gandhi from his Indian distance had taken up; and in India, his misadventure during 1940-45 on the issue of the Congress support to the war effort showed how a rigid adherence to formalism did not take one too far.

Gandhi was too big a man, however, not to know that moral maxims, however good it was, could not by itself bring about basic social change. 'I have no influence', he once wrote², 'to direct people's energy in a channel in which they have no interest'. He also knew that his

¹ John Lewis, *Marxism and the Open Mind*, London, 1937, pp. 112 et seq.

² *Harper*, 26 July 1942.

movements had props that were not quite good enough. 'I am quite of your opinion', he wrote to Jawaharlal Nehru on 1 April 1928, 'that some day we shall have to start an intestine movement without the rich people and without the vocal educated class'.⁹ Such a movement, unfortunately, he never could bring himself to start, not even in 1945-46, when with no more than a slight risk to his fixation about non-violence, he could have organised and led a magnificent uprising.

One might be permitted to say that if only Gandhi had a certain detachment and could appreciate the problems of his people in the setting of a world society, whose social and economic imperatives were to him unfamiliar and unpleasant, he could perhaps have shown the country the way it should traverse. That was a task which Sun Yat-sen did, but Gandhi, with his many-splendoured personality, did not.

Who is there in history, however, who has fulfilled every expectation? And from Gandhi we have got so much that, for all our differences, we must be grateful. Thus, in spite of the fact that the man, to whose name India has responded more than to any other in a thousand years, loved the toiling masses no doubt, but never really thought them adult enough for purposes of social struggle.

The answers which Gandhian ideas give to our problems—of poverty, of the land, of industrial advance—command respect but are not, except in isolation, effective. All the gifts evoked by the *satyagraha* spirit—of land, of whole villages, of poverty, of life itself—illustrate an estimable idealism but solve no real problems and do not obviate the need of secure of political power by the people for socio-economic transformations. Such qualities as tolerance and compassion and denunciations from evil, can really come into their own after the ground is cleared by the people's own actions. In creating the atmosphere for such action, Gandhi made a unique contribution, but to such action itself he was indifferent and sometimes even hostile.

Except in beautiful flashes of stern on right conduct, he could not show India the way ahead in an unconformably complicated world. He roused our people, however, from the torpor of ages, and gave them a new spirit—obedience, fearlessness, and the courage to fight. Communists, who differ from him drastically, salute him sincerely. And there are tasks in which Communists and Gandhi's followers can join hands together, for we live in times when, if we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we might all lose the future.

9. B.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma*, WHE, pp. 131-32.

Gandhism and the Ghana Conference

HOMER A. JACK

The All-African People's Conference, held in Ghana in December 1958, was as anticipated in the African world as the Bandung Conference in 1955 was awaited in Afro-Asia. While all kinds of predictions were made about the Accra Conference, few if any persons anticipated that the single most debated issue would be the relevance of non-violent resistance to rid the African continent of colonialism and racism. What follows is a discussion of this debate at the Ghana Conference.

The All-African Conference was in the tradition of several Pan-African congresses held since 1900, but this¹ was the first on African soil and, as it turned out, the most representative gathering ever held in Africa. It was technically called by a number of African political parties, but Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana was an inspiration, aided by George Padmore, his adviser on African affairs.

In a four-page leaflet published in advance of the Conference, and urging delegates to attend, there was strong emphasis on non-violence. For example, one sentence read: 'The Conference will formulate and proclaim our African Personality based on the philosophy of Pan-African Socialism as the ideology of the African Non-violent Revolution'. In another paragraph on the aims and objects of the Conference, it was stated that 'the main purpose of the All-African People's Conference . . . will be to formulate concrete plans and work out the Gandhian tactics and strategy of the African Non-violent Revolution' in relation to colonialism, racism, and tribalism, including the chieftancy.

This call to the Conference sounded more like a postscript manifesto resulting from the deliberations of a convention than a preliminary

invitation, but it is known that on the first anniversary of Ghana's independence, in March 1958, several African leaders converged on Ghana, ostensibly to celebrate this event but also to plan for the Agra Conference. For tactical and strategic reasons, it was probably agreed at that time to give a Gandhian emphasis to the proposed Conference.

The meetings were scheduled to begin in Agra on 3 December 1958, but the first plenary session was not held until 8 December. The intervening days were occupied with the organisation of the Conference. A Steering Committee took over the functions of the Preparatory Commission and there were also occasional meetings of heads of delegations. At the very first Steering Committee meeting, Mr M. Fouad Ghali, head of the delegation from the United Arab Republic, raised objections to the non-violent emphasis in the call to the Conference. In a closed session he reportedly said that their brothers in Algeria were fighting a bloody and violent civil war for four years and that any talk of non-violence was an insult to them. He asked that the aim of the Conference to formulate a non-violent approach be stricken by the Committee from any Conference literature and, in any case, no discussion of the subject be placed on the Conference agenda. This sudden and rather unexpected challenge by the U.A.R. was met by delegates from the Union of South Africa, Kenya and Ghana. The issue became poised and it continued to be the most hotly debated subject during the entire Agra Conference. In one way or another, the relevance of non-violence was raised every day during the Conference and naturally found its way into private discussions at the Conference and into many press interpretations.

In several speeches at the plenary session, direct or oblique references were made to this controversy. For example, Prime Minister Nkrumah in his welcoming speech at the opening session said: 'We have pride in our determination to support every form of non-violent action which our fellow Africans in colonial territories may find it fit to use in the struggle for their legitimate rights and aspirations'. This speech may well have been written before the U.A.R. delegate precipitated the controversy, but it was known that Nkrumah strongly supported the non-violent emphasis. In his autobiography, *Ghana*, published on the eve of his country's independence in 1957, Nkrumah wrote: 'At first I could not understand how Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence could possibly be effective. It seemed to me to be utterly feeble and without hope of success. The solution of the colonial problem, as I saw it at that time, lay in armed rebellion. How is it possible, I asked myself, for a revolution to succeed without arms and ammunition? After months of studying Gandhi's policy and watching the effect it had, I began to see that, when

backed by strong political organizations, it could be the solution to the colonial problem.'

It can be said that the Egyptians attacked the non-violent position during the Conference even more than the Algerians, who were in the midst of violence. Ahmed Benmougel, leader of the Algerian delegation, at one point said: 'If the imperialists will grant freedom through peaceful negotiations, we see no reason why we should resort to violence. What is happening in Algeria has happened in China.' He added that delegates to the Conference were divided on the question of violence 'because there are two forms of colonialism'. By this cryptic remark he may have reflected the common notion that one form of colonialism—the French—knew no other language than violence. Dr Omar Farcas, another representative from Algeria, told the Conference that in the fight for freedom, the African now had to resort to any available device 'including force and violence'.

Other speakers also commented on the issue during major speeches at the plenary sessions. Ali Abdillahi, of the Somali Democratic Party in French Somaliland, claimed that the imperialists, with diabolical disruptiveness, are 'anxious for the ideology of Gandhiism and non-violence and try to show that Communism is coming to dominate Africa. The African peoples are not concerned either with Gandhiism or Communism.' Dr Oikonyo Kioko of Kenya, representing the Pan-African Freedom Movement of East and Central Africa, in a more responsible speech said: 'First there is need to proclaim the firm and noble ideological principles which guide our freedom struggle. In this respect we believe in the moral and mighty power of non-violence, but not in the idea of turning the other cheek. We believe in the mighty force of an uncompromising will and the readiness to suffer and sacrifice for the ideal of democracy which is the goal of our struggle.' In a message to the Conference, Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Prime Minister of Western Nigeria, advocated non-violence: 'It should be possible for the Conference to use constitutional, non-violent, but constructive and positive methods as its weapons, to work out a five-year plan for the attainment of sovereignty'. He was, however, speaking mainly about those non-self-governing areas in Africa without white settlers.

It became obvious that there was much misunderstanding of non-violent resistance at the Conference. Some delegates were confusing non-violence with non-resistance. The latter was unthinkable for African nationalists, especially attending a meeting designated to announce the final assault against colonialism and racism for the entire continent. At one point several delegates, fraternal delegates, and observers who

believed strongly in non-violent resistance as a principle, tried to find out how all delegates could be made to realize that non-violent techniques have been used in South Africa, East Africa, and West Africa with good results. Some of those associated with these Gandhian campaigns in Africa managed to speak up, but there was really no time for a careful delineation of this theme during the Conference itself.

The Steering Committee early in the Conference decided not to make an over-all judgement on the relevance of non-violence and not to put it *per se* on the Conference agenda, but to allow each committee of the Conference to discuss the subject whenever it arose. As a matter of fact, discussion on the topic arose in most committee sessions, but chiefly in the committee dealing with colonialism and racism.

On several occasions, Mr Tom Mboya of Kenya, chairman of the entire Conference, tried to be a moderating influence in the debate. In the midpoint of the week-long Conference he held a press conference and declared: "We do not and will not accept violence as our policy". He added that all statements on strategic methods to gain freedom which would offer 'any realistic approach' would be accepted by the Conference. He said that the interpretation of non-violent strategy depended upon conditions in each territory, adding: 'The Western powers have pledged their policy for peace but that does not mean that when the Africans are provoked they will not fight'. He said that violent tendencies were bound to arise where there were situations in which people were denied their rights. To another question, Mboya answered: 'African leaders at this Conference are not pledged to any pacific policies. They are not pacifists. If you hit them, they might hit back'. Elsewhere Mboya said: 'We believe in non-violence and positive action, but the attitude and approach of the colonials will determine the tactics which must be used'.

The final plenary session of the Conference endorsed the resolution on method as introduced by the First Committee on colonialism and imperialism. One version was as follows: "Recognizing that national independence can be gained by peaceful means in territories where democratic means are available, it guarantees its support to all forms of peaceful action. This support is pledged equally to those who, in order to meet the violent means by which they are subjected and exploited, are obliged to retaliate." A slightly different version appeared in another report of the same First Committee: 'The Conference declares its full support to all fighters for freedom in Africa, to all those who resort to peaceful means of non-violence and civil disobedience as well as to those who are compelled to retaliate against violence to attain national

independence and freedom for the people. Where such resolutions become necessary, the Conference condemns all legislation which considers those who fight for their independence and freedom as ordinary criminals.'

This is perhaps the best compromise that could have been expected, given the conditions of the Conference: the first time that most of the delegates ever came together, the civil war continuing in Algeria, strong memories of violence in Kenya, lack of time to discuss the issue carefully, and the lack of a conscious Gandhian bloc to oppose the conscious U. A. R. bloc (on this issue). The compromise, while not admitting the superiority of non-violence, did put the onus for violence on the colonial powers. This was, in terms of Africa's relation to the world, next best to the Conference's asserting flatly that Africans would not use violence. It was unfortunate that the Second Committee, which discussed racism, did not refer to the method of non-violence, since racism especially has been attacked in South Africa, as in North America, using this technique.

The opposition between violence and non-violence manifested itself in two specific suggestions made to the Conference. One was for the creation by the independent African states of an 'African Legion' consisting of volunteers who will be ready to protect the freedom of the African peoples'. This would presumably come to the aid of the National Liberation Front in Algeria and, later, various nationalist groups all over the continent. While this resolution was approved, it is doubtful if it will be immediately implemented.

Michael Scott, the Anglican priest who has identified himself so completely with African freedom, in his address to the plenary session (representing the Herero people and their chiefs in South-west Africa) called for 'new techniques of civilized revolution'. He advocated a 'Freedom Army of volunteers to take the offensive with methods of non-violence and civil disobedience wherever there is colonialism and racism'. He added that there is 'a force mightier than imperial rule and one day it will liberate even the Union of South Africa from tyranny'. This suggestion was not endorsed, as far as is known, by any Conference committee and thus it is unlikely that a non-violent Freedom Army will soon march on Pretoria.

The African leaders and their followers need a better understanding of the principles and efficacy of non-violent resistance. It is ironic that it was on the African continent that Gandhi first made his experiments with non-violent truth. Non-violent resistance, as perfected by him in India, must apparently be reintroduced into the African continent.

To Live in Mankind

A Memoir of Reginald Reynolds

ETHEL MANNIN

It is never easy, I think, to write about someone who has been for many years so dear and close to one as to seem part of one's very self, one's *alter ego*. The task is made even more difficult when that person is newly dead. It was three years before I could bring myself to write a monograph of my father, which I eventually did under the title, *This Was a Gândî Man*, and as I write this my husband, Reginald Reynolds, has been dead less than three months.

It was at Reginald's suggestion that I wrote the monograph of my father, whom he greatly loved and admired, and the title we decided upon would serve for him too, but it could be, not qualified, but amplified into *This Was a Gândî Man*. He himself recently wrote in *Gândî Mâg* of a fellow Quaker, John Heyland, in those terms, writing as I do now, *in memoriam*. He had always a great veneration for any true 'Gândî man', and sometimes, laughingly, explaining his vegetarianism, or his dislike of possessions, he would describe himself as that; but such was his humility that he would no more have dreamed of calling himself in all seriousness by a title he so revered than St Francis of Assisi would 'presume'—so it is said of that humble saintly man—to call himself a Christian.

But others may presume, for it is a true statement. Gândî was the first of two profound influences in the spiritual development of Reginald Reynolds; that influence began in 1929, when as a young man of twenty-four he met Gândî at his farm at Sabarwal and lived and worked with him for a year, during which time he acted as envoy to the

British Raj, carrying the historic ultimatum. Thereafter Gandhi called him *Ajgad*...¹

The second profound influence in his spiritual development was John Woolman, the eighteenth century American Quaker, in whom he became so deeply interested that he wrote a book, *The Wisdom of John Woolman*, published since the war. His interest in and veneration for Woolman follows naturally on from his veneration for Gandhi; for Woolman, also, was what could be today described as a 'Gandhi man', since it was his belief that 'if all inhabitants lived according to sound wisdom, labouring to promote universal love and righteousness, and ceased from every inordinate desire after wealth, and from all customs which are tainted with luxury, the way would be easy to live comfortably on honest employment'. That Woolman wrote and spoke strongly against the slave trade and upheld the rights of the Red Indians spoke also very much to Reginald's condition—to use the Quaker phrase—for he cared as intensely about race-relations as about pacifism. Indeed he considered the two things bound up with each other; you do not love your fellow man by discriminating against him because he happens to have a different coloured skin from your own, he would say, and the only way to end wars is through the universal brotherhood of man, irrespective of race or creed, religious or political.

When Reginald talked about loving your fellow man he quite simply meant it. He had a capacity for friendship which amounted to genius. When he died I received letters from all over the world, from people of all races, all classes, all degrees of intelligence; from scholarly people and very simple, humble people; from students and from professors, from distinguished and famous people, and from people who never knew Reginald as a witty satiric poet, writer of brilliant scholarly books, propagandist for pacifist and anti-colonialist ideas, but simply as 'good old Regi'—someone to crack a joke with, tell your troubles to, have a cup of tea or coffee with, someone with a huge sense of humour, someone to laugh with, someone possessed of the warmest and most generous heart that ever beat in a human breast.

Wherever country he walked on his world-wide travels, which he undertook in order to 'spread the gospel' of better race-relations, the gospel of Gandhi and John Woolman, the gospel of world peace—not merely opposition to nuclear weapons but opposition to war *itself*, waged in any form whatsoever, on any scale whatsoever—from all these great journeyings that were an essential part of his dedicated life, he came back

1. After Rām's preliminary to Rānaga (as told in the *Rānaga*).

loving the people, and the more unarticulate and under-privileged they were the more they commanded his love and concern. A few years ago he did a fabulous seven months' journey from Cairo to Capetown, by train, bus, car, lorry—any and every way except by air. He called it 'a pilgrimage in quest of hope'. He wanted to get an overall picture of Africa resurgent and to discover how much goodwill towards it there was among the non-Africans—and he found more than he had dared to hope for, and in the part of the continent where he had expected least, South Africa, he found most. He called the book he wrote about that journey, *Beware of Africans*, from a road sign he came across and which impressed him—not beware of cattle, such as it sometimes found on English motor-roads, but beware of Africans, as though they were cattle. He encountered many fine people on that journey, both black and white, and I have been told that there are now little boys in Africa, little African boys, called Reginald Reynolds. — Had he known that, I am quite sure it would have brought tears to his eyes. 'Oh, bless their hearts', I can hear him say. He loved children and they loved him. He loved young people. He liked talking in schools, and in America in the summer camps and work camps in which many students like to spend their holidays. In a holiday camp he would never be content to be merely the visiting lecturer; he liked to work with the young people, laying bricks, felling trees, chopping wood—he dearly loved to 'swing an axe', as he called it, and was very proficient at it—and he liked to go swimming and walking with them and sit round the campfires singing with them—unlike most Englishmen he had a very good singing voice and could sing without self-consciousness. In America he learned to do 'square dancing', and he added to his repertory of folk-songs. One of his most prized possessions—he who had so few—was an old pair of black corduroy trousers covered with dried clay and cement, honourable souvenir of many hours hard work in many work-camps in England and the United States. Similarly in India in 1929 he could not be just a visiting young Englishman; he learned to spin, and he took his part in the manual work of the *Shram* life.

I have called this piece 'To Live in Mankind' because that was the title of Reginald's book about Gandhi—he sub-titled it 'A Quest for Gandhi'—written after his second visit to India, which was not until the end of 1949, when he attended the World Pacific Conference held at Sarnathpur and Sevagram. He had originally thought of calling the book 'Eagle Forgotten', borrowing from Yeats's poem, *The Eagle that is Forgotten*, but subsequently took instead from a line in the poem itself—'To live in mankind is far more than to live in a name'—and called it, simply, *To Live in Mankind*.

Reginald Reynolds also is an eagle not forgotten, and it is true of him, too, that he lived in and for mankind, and that both his memory and his influence will continue to do so. He will live in his writings and in the hearts of the men and women, boys and girls, to whom he went out in loving friendship. All over the world there are people who have taken new heart of hope from contact with his vital personality and through the moral force of his example.

Perhaps his best book, and one which is likely to become a modern classic, is his witty, erudite history of sanitation, *Cleanliness and Godliness*, which in spite of its Rabelaisian high spirits is nevertheless fundamentally a very serious work, postulating the necessity for the return of sewage to the soil instead of the wasteful Western method of disposal in the sea. But the books which meant most to him were undoubtedly his pre-war study of India under the British Raj, *The White Sahib in India*, for which his friend Jawaharlal Nehru wrote the Preface, his work on Woolman, *The Window of John Woolman*, and his 'quest for Gandhi', *To Live in Mankind*. Just before he sailed for Australia, on 4 November 1934, on that lecture tour for the Australian Quakers which I had urged should be his 'last long journey', and which ended in Adelaide on 16 December, when he died of a cerebral haemorrhage, he had completed a child's life of Gandhi, the proofs of which I am awaiting at the time of writing this. He enjoyed doing this book and felt that he had made a 'good job' of it. He also told me, apropos of what I was writing about him in a volume of autobiography I was working on in our last months together, that he considered his *White Sahib* a more important contribution to the Indian independence campaign than the, at the time, much publicized carrying of Gandhi's ultimatum to the British Raj. Not merely was the last book he wrote a child's life of Gandhi, but in the last article he wrote¹, on the train from West Australia to Adelaide, a few days before his death, he tells of a visit to a Fremantle prison where he gave a talk on Gandhi to the mainly aborigine and half-caste prisoners. Characteristically, he was very much interested in the Australian aborigines and half-castes and their struggle for citizenship; he found a great deal of very uphill work to be done, but 'the fight was on', as he wrote to me, and he seemed hopeful of the outcome.

Many people have asked me if I intend writing a biography of Reginald Reynolds; the answer is No, because he wrote his autobiography only a few years ago, *My Life and Career*, an enterprising work which he opens by declaring that he had thought of calling it 'My Wife and

1. For *Peace News* (London), published in their issue of 20 January 1935.

Crimes', except for the fact that his 'crimes' began long before he met me in 1935. He was fond of saying that there were three Reginald Reynolds: the serious Quaker propagandist, concerned with race-relations, pacifism, anti-colonialism; the scribbler, bustling through odd byways of research in the British Museum reading-room and producing such works as *Brick*, and *Sparks*, and *Civility and Godliness*; the sardonic writer of satiric verses on current political affairs for the *New Statesman*—and all three of them, he would add, are married to Ethel Mannin . . .

The picture is not quite complete, however. There were his three public aspects as writer and lecturer, and it is through them that he will 'live in mankind'. But there is another sense in which he will be remembered—as the gay and good companion, the loyal and fantastically generous and warm-hearted friend, to people of all kinds, all ages, the world over. There is a family in Tokyo where he is mourned as a son. There is a man in England who has been for years in prison but who counts his long sentence worth while, since but for it he would never have known the one true friendship of his life. He knows that he has lost his Best Friend. So do many people—myself not least. And the world has lost a fighter for truth and justice and the Gandhian approach to life it can ill afford to lose in this most menacing of all human eras.

Tall and thin and sun-browned and striking-looking, with strong aquiline features that were full of humour and gentleness, he was so intensely alive, this Reginald Reynolds, Gandhi's *Aged*, so boyish in appearance and manner, that it was difficult to think of him as middle-aged, and difficult to think of him as no longer alive—as people have written to me from all over the world. But it is as though wherever he went 'a hundred white eagles arose', as in the poem he loved, roused by his faith and enthusiasm to continue the fight for all he stood for, and the winds of all the world cry triumphantly to his departed valiant spirit:

The zeal in their wings is a zeal that your dreaming began,
The valour that went out your soul in the service of man.

There could be no finer epitaph for one who lived so intensely for mankind, and will continue to live in it.

Gandhi as a Seer and Prophet

ESME WYNNE-TYSON

A few months before his passing, Gandhi wrote¹ : 'My love of nature cure does not blind me to the advances that Western medicine has made, in spite of the fact that I have stigmatised it as black magic. I have used a harsh term, and I do not withdraw it ; because . . . it has countenanced vivisection and all the awfulness it means and because it will stop at no practice, however bad it may be, if it prolongs the life of the body and because it ignores the immortal soul . . .'

In the decade immediately following this statement, medical propaganda in the West, extolling its miracles of surgery, its wonder-drugs (which, however, had a strange habit of being quickly replaced by others, owing to unfortunate 'side-effects') its vaccines and painkillers, increased to such an extent that most of the world bent its knee before the God of *material* medicine, and the powers accorded to its practitioners have amounted to a positive tyranny by consent. In every country, except Britain, the vaccination of infants is compulsory. In France there is compulsory inoculation for five different complaints. It is impossible to travel without submitting to the injection of diseased animal matter into a healthy blood-stream. It is almost impossible to escape from the authoritative spell of what Gandhi so truly called 'Black Magic'. But hypnotised by its loudly proclaimed achievements, the majority of mankind, including, perhaps, some of the more 'progressive' admirers of Gandhi, must have felt that his denunciation of modern medicine was perhaps a little outmoded, and due possibly to an incomplete knowledge of the potentialities of his subject.

1. *Harper*, 12 August 1946.

But prophets of the status of Gandhi do not pronounce judgement lightly or superficially. He spoke from the long-term viewpoint of the ear, aware that evil means can never, finally, secure good ends. Today the rightness of his judgement, not only on Western medical science, but also on technological industrialism and other forms of materialistic science, is becoming ever more apparent.

In the recently published 230-page report by eighty-three scientists of different nations on radiation hazards, we were informed that radiation given for medical purposes far outweighs any other kind of man-made radiation, and therefore the danger of infection 'in well-developed countries with good medical facilities' is far greater than in backward countries that lack these 'advantages'.

Here, indeed, is a swift *karuna* for those whose fears for their physical health have led them to courtesance and encourage the Black Magic which demands the torture and slaughter of millions of animals a year in the research laboratories. Their lauded Health Service is found to be one of the chief dangers to their health! Prenatal X-ray treatment may result in leukaemia, blindness and other genetic defects in the next generation.

But this is by no means the only tragic result of the unethical method of experimentation on animals, which has led, inevitably, to experimentation on human beings. In a letter printed in 1957 in the *Cleveland Science Monitor*, it was stated that prisoners in the Ohio State Penitentiary of Columbus, U.S.A., said to be 'volunteers', had been implanted with cancer, while infants under six months of age born to inmates of the State Reformatory for Women at Clinton N.C.—who could not possibly be described as 'volunteers'—had been fed with live polio virus for experimental purposes.

Thus, having allowed helpless animals to be subjected to the tyranny of science, humanity now finds itself helpless before the same scientific curiosity, a situation long ago foreseen by the Western humanitarian, George Bernard Shaw, who, at the beginning of this century, wrote in the Preface to his play, *The Doctor's Dilemma*: 'Once grant the ethics of the vivisectionist and you not only sanction the experiment on the human subject but make it the first duty of the vivisectionist. If a guinea pig may be sacrificed for the sake of the very little that can be learnt from it, shall not a man be sacrificed for the sake of the great deal that can be learnt from him?' Apparently only those who practised *ahimsa* had clear enough vision to foresee where the scientific irreverence for life was leading mankind.

Modern India which, we are told, is in danger of being englamoured by the marvels of Western medical science and of turning a deaf ear to the wisdom of Bhikṣu, should consider the following facts. In 1957 in Britain the Health Service drugs and medicines cost the tax-payer £66,000,000. Does this sound like a healthy nation? Moreover, in a Report published by the Stationery Office, after 300,000 people had been interviewed in a sickness survey, it is stated that 'at any age and in any month at least fifty per cent. of adults asked about their health complained of some illness'. And this despite free medical advice and a vast army of doctors!

In a letter printed in the American magazine, *Progressive*, a native of a country that prides itself on having the best Health Service in the world, writes of the true state of affairs in America as distinct from the propaganda of the American Medical Association: 'Let's look around us. The physicians' offices, the hospitals, sanatoria, and insane asylums are running over. Millions of dollars worth of patent medicines are sold. Degenerative diseases are on the increase. More cancer, more heart trouble, more arthritis, more colds, more 'flu. We're the sickest nation in the world. . . .' Since they employ the same healing methods, a similar story would doubtless come from the Communist countries, if freedom of speech were allowed.

Does all this suggest that healing by *āśuā*, or agonising experiments on animals, which Gandhi so forthrightly condemned, added to the high standard of living so universally coveted, can ensure the health of mankind?

Gautama the Buddha, Mahāvira and Gandhi, all taught explicitly the need for harmlessness and compassion, and their instructions have been generally believed to have proceeded from loving consideration for the lower creatures, but may they not have sprung from a still deeper compassion for human beings who could only be saved from violence by their renunciation of it as a method? For these great Teachers well knew the law of cause and effect, and that the will to destroy must inevitably act as a boomerang. 'Those who live by the sword must die by the sword'.

A startling example of this has recently come to light in an article printed in the *American Mercury* (July 1956) entitled 'Pesticides Poison U. S.' in which it is pointed out that the DDT and other insecticides that have so much improved the inhabitants of economically 'backward' countries by their swift elimination of pests, are not only disturbing the balance of nature in the U. S. A. by killing off the birds and small ani-

male, but are quite literally poisoning first the food and then the inhabitants of that country. This is due to the despoiling of food crops with poisons, sometimes spraying as much as three million pounds of DDT by air on three million densely populated acres, with the unforeseen result that the insects, particularly mosquitoes, build up a resistance to the poisons which have therefore to be continually increased in strength becoming thereby more and more of a danger to the animal and human population. They eventually become so potent that, according to the reports—which should be noted by Indians everywhere—newly developed pesticides that proved “too hot” for the American market are being shipped abroad to countries that have taken fewer precautions—or none—on the use of pesticides’. Here even the Western writer perceives the possibility of the result of such a course, for he goes on to ask: ‘How many of these “hot” compounds might return to America by the way of imports that have been contaminated by them?’

Thus the world, if it could only realize it, is being forced to admit the age-old wisdom of the East, well-known to Gandhi, that life is one, and that destruction sets up a chain reaction of further destruction, while harmlessness, advocated by all the great religions, has the opposite effect.

Gandhi, however, was realistic about the difficulties of consistently practicing *ahimsa*. It was, he admitted, impossible to live in the flesh and not be guilty of *ahimsa* which was an integral part of physical life, but it should be reduced to a minimum and not increased to dimensions that would upset the balance of nature as it is in the present world of scientific materialism.

In *Young India*¹ he wrote: ‘All life in the flesh exists by some *ahimsa*. Hence the highest religion has been defined by a negative word *ahimsa*. The world is bound in a chain of destruction. In other words, *ahimsa* is an inherent necessity for life in the body. That is why a votary of *ahimsa* always prays for ultimate deliverance from the bondage of the flesh.’

And Gandhi knew what the materialists of the West and East have yet to learn, that this bondage cannot be broken by physical death, or by man death-dealing methods in order to safeguard physical life. It can only be broken by thinking and living our way out of the flesh, and that includes the increasing practice of *ahimsa*, *brahmacharya* and *satyagraha* in our individual lives.

1. 4 October 1921.

Britain Considers Her Weapons

A Record of a Debate

GENE SHARP

Does it 'make sense' for a modern Western country to cease relying on military defence and to substitute non-violent resistance as its defence policy? This question has been in recent months very widely discussed in Britain. The debate has followed the call by *Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall* for a Royal Commission (or other official body) to investigate whether or not non-violent resistance offers a better defence policy than nuclear weapons. This article is a record of the main events and arguments in the first round of what promises to be a continuing debate. As far as possible, the views which have been expressed in this debate are presented here in the words of the participants.

The idea of fully rejecting military defence is, of course, not new. It is not even new to argue the case on non-pacifist grounds for the substitution of military force with non-violent resistance to meet any possible invasion. For example, in the West this proposal has been made with largely non-pacifist arguments in recent years in the United States by *Cecil E. Hurst*,¹ former President of *William Penn College*, and in Norway by *Professor Arne Næss*,² of the *Institute of Philosophy and the History of Ideas of the University of Oslo*. The *Dutch Church and Peace*

1. See, for example, his *Non-Violent Resistance: A Nation's Way to Peace*, Wallingford, Pennsylvania, 1956, Fonda Hill, 40 pp.

2. See, for example, his lectures delivered in Oslo on 30 October 1953, *Christian Defence for Norway*, published in *Peace News*, 27 September and 4 October 1957.

organisation in 1932 published *Nirapek Warachandh*¹ (*A New Road to Defence*) discussing non-violent resistance as a moral alternative to war. Many Western pacifists, especially when pressed as to what should be done if a pacifist country were invaded, have advocated non-violent resistance to defeat the aggressor.

In India Gandhi made similar proposals. In 1929 he wrote in *Young India*: 'The I know, that if India comes to her own demonstrably through non-violent means, India will never want to carry a vast army, an equally grand navy, and a grander air force'.² In 1940 he opposed the Congress resolution offering full, active participation in World War II if Britain granted India immediate independence, saying: 'I do not want to prepare India for military defence from today'.³ When Indians in the pre-independence provisional government considered the full military budget, Gandhi warned that reliance on armed force could mean military dictatorship and a menace to world peace.⁴ When the army was obtained after independence, Gandhi condemned this as 'madness' and still hoped that India would turn to the way of non-violence.⁵ The alternative to the military, Gandhi believed, was non-violent defence: '... however small a nation or even a group may be, it is able, even as the individual, provided that it has one mind as also the will and the grit, to defend its honour and self-respect against a whole world of arms. Therein consists the matchless strength and beauty of the unarmed. That is non-violent defence which neither knows nor accepts defeat at any stage. Therefore, a nation or a group which has made non-violence its final policy, cannot be subjected to slavery even by the atom bomb'.⁶

In the West, as well, appeals to renounce military might and resort to non-violent resistance when freedom is threatened have hitherto received only slight attention. Far more response, however, has been aroused in Britain when a similar proposal was made on strategic and military grounds by a prominent man with a military background. This was Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall, Sir Stephen is no pacifist, although he is by no means unconcerned with moral issues. He retired from the Royal Navy in 1929 after serving on the Royal Navy Staff College, the China Squadron, the Staff College at Camberley, as an Intelligence Officer

1. Ashok, 1932, Van Loghem Sterkess, 126 pp.

2. *Young India*, 9 May 1929. (This and the following citations from Gandhi are taken from *Non-Violence in Peace and War*, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 2 vols.)

3. *Madras*, 13 August 1940.

4. *Ibid.*, 12 January, 13 and 27 July, 1947.

5. *Ibid.*, 7 December 1947.

6. *Ibid.*, 24 August 1946.

with the Mediterranean Fleet and the Atlantic Fleet and on the Admiralty Naval Staff. He is the author of many books, including *A Naval Lieutenant, 1914-1918*; *Western Civilization and the Far East*; *The War at Sea, 1914-1918*; *Imperial Defence and The Communist Conspiracy*. Now he is a widely respected political commentator. Many ordinary people who never read political analysis remember him from their childhood when he told them stories over the BBC. His weekly *Klag-Hell News-Letter* was founded in 1936; in a country where such individually edited newsletters are virtually non-existent it is widely read and carries considerable influence. He personally knows, and is highly respected by most of Britain's political leaders of all parties and top military men. Politically, Sir Stephen is an Independent. He was an Independent Member of Parliament for the Ormskirk Division of Lancashire, 1939-43. In his *News-Letter* he criticises policies and leaders of all political parties when he thinks they deserve to be criticized. In 1944 he founded the Harvard Society for Parliamentary Government, dedicated to promoting the cause of the institution of parliament in all its democratic forms, and is its Honorary Director and Chairman of its Council.

Personally, Sir Stephen has a pleasant, informal but dignified air. He is capable of penetrating insights, and he holds to his decisions tenaciously. He has a reputation for sometimes having rather unusual ideas. Someone commented on hearing of his proposal for an enquiry into non-violent defense: 'This is the strangest of them'. That proposal, Sir Stephen points out, has come not as a sudden bright idea, but as the product of years of thinking about possible alternatives to modern war. Prior to World War II, for example, he expounded a scheme for undermining the Nazi regime without war, and aroused Nazi fury by sending through the post thousands of appeals to German businessmen to oppose the Nazi regime. Goebbels sent Sir Stephen a blistering reply—which Sir Stephen promptly published as a full page of the *Daily Telegraph*, along with a challenge to Goebbels to reproduce the letters, if he dared.¹

Belton's position as a potential H-bomb target makes its people particularly aware of the moral and physical dangers of nuclear weapons. As a relatively small country with a highly concentrated population, there wouldn't be very much left if hydrogen bombs started falling—and most people in Belton know it. It is not unusual in conversations about the future, for people to add (trying to jest about it): '... that is, if we're still here'. Public opinion has not been deceived by official statements on nuclear dangers, many of which have been surprisingly honest. The 1957 *White Paper on Defence*, prepared by the Secretary of Defence Mr Duncan Sandys, bluntly told the British public: 'It must be frankly recognized

that there is at present no means of providing adequate protection for the people of this country against the consequences of an attack with nuclear weapons. Though, in the event of war, the fighter aircraft of the Royal Air Force would unquestionably be able to take a heavy toll of enemy bombers, a proportion would inevitably get through. Even if it were only a dozen, they could with megaton bombs inflict widespread devastation.¹⁰ While in Australia in August 1957 Mr Sandys declared that the British Government had taken 'a very bold step in deciding not to do the impossible' (*ibid.*). He said: 'We decided not to defend the whole country, but to defend only our bomber bases. I must pay tribute to the people of Great Britain for the readiness with which they have accepted these harsh but inescapable facts.'¹¹ Sir Stephen says of this: '... when we got to a stage in the development of armed forces that obliges our Minister of Defence to say that the purpose of our armed force is to protect itself so that it can wipe out our enemy immediately after we are wiped out, we are beginning to live in an *Alas-in-Furberland* world in which means and ends are fused into a new element of meaningless content.'¹²

Sir Stephen first issued his present challenge on defence in a long article '*Reflections on Defence*' in the *King's Hall News-Letter* for 24 April 1957. He proposed that, 'in the light of the novel and unprecedented defence problem which now faces the United Kingdom, Western Europe and to a lesser extent the U.S.A.', a Royal Commission or a committee of the Imperial Defence College be appointed to consider the possibilities of non-violent resistance as a national defence policy. He pointed out that 'the question on which the *Defence White Paper* is silent is whether physical means are the only or even the best method of defence'. Sir Stephen presented a closely reasoned analysis of the nature of defence and changes in defence problems which have been introduced by civilian resistance movements (both violent and non-violent) and by nuclear weapons. He urged readers to put aside all 'preconceived notions about defence and start from the simple proposition that we desire to defend our way of life and would prefer not to do it by risking its utter destruction'. Sir Stephen declared that 'a fully pacifist policy' had 'never been thoroughly examined from a strictly political-strategical angle'. 'I am not saying it would work', he said, but that it deserved investigation. The retired Navy Commander proposed that a Royal Commission be established 'with the task of ex-

10. *Defence Outline of Future Policy*, Presented by the Minister of Defence to Parliament, April 1957, London, H.M. Stationery Office, Cmd.124, pp. 25.

11. Quoted by Sir Stephen in his lecture at the Royal United Services Institution, 9 October 1957.

12. In his lecture cited above.

presenting an opinion upon the problem of 'whether our way of life could be defended by passive resistance and if so what the plan should be'. He pointed out that the influence of Gandhi and of the South African bas boycotters had risen with their reliance on non-violent methods. 'Has it been, or can it be, proved that a United Kingdom, with an intelligent and sophisticated population educated to regard a national plan of passive resistance as the defence policy of the country, would lose influence? I think there is a case for a very thorough investigation of this matter.'

+

Sir Stephen's case for an investigation was aimed at those 'practical people' who are rarely convinced by pacifist arguments. Yet the first source of strong support came from *Peace News*, the pacifist weekly newspaper with offices in London. Week after week it pushed the demand for an investigation with articles from prominent, largely non-pacifist, personalities in politics, religion, and other fields of British life. *Peace News* reprinted the full text of 'Reflections on Defence' on 10 May, and thousands of reprints of this were distributed in addition to a new printing of the *King-Hall News-Letter* edition. *Peace News* rallied articles and statements of support from such persons as these: *Professor Barbara Wootton* (now *Barbara Wootton*, one of the two first women members of the House of Lords), *Frank Allson, M.P.*, *Commander Thomas Fox-Pitt, Anthony Greenwood, M.P.*, *Pennar Brockway, M.P.*, *Dr Donald Soper, Reginald Thompson, S.*, *Sydney Sherman, M.P.*, *Robert S. W. Pollard, Ian Mikardo, M.P.*, *Michael de la Bedoyere, Henry Caborn, M.P.*, *Christopher Hobbs, Aldous Huxley, Basil Davidson, Roy Mann, M.P.*, *Stuart Morris, J. Allen Skinner, Gerald Gardner, Q. C.*, and *Archbishop T. O. Roberts, S. J.* Sir Stephen followed up his article with a second in the *King-Hall News-Letter*: 'Non-violent Resistance: Some questions which would require investigation'. The BBC Television Drama Trust discussed the idea sympathetically on 12 May. The panel consisted of *Mrs Packer, Sir John Maude, Earl Bernard Russell, and Alan Bullock.*

Barbara Wootton, one of the most outstanding British thinkers, called Sir Stephen's proposal 'a most significant event' and a sign that non-violent resistance 'is just creeping over the frontier which divides the cranks from the respectable'. The ranks of 'respectable opinion' had been breached. 'Now that the first step has been taken, the second and third become immensely more likely. And in this case we have on our side a growing body of evidence that organised (and organisation is vital: the individual martyr is rarely now more than a passing wonder) non-

violence has always carried the day wherever it has been persistently tried. Even Lord Mountbatten removed his sword when paying his respects at Gandhi's tomb.'

Frank Ailawa, M.P., called the King-Hall article 'the most remarkable, most important, most brilliant thing I've read for a long time', and pacifist *Stuart Morris* called the proposal 'timely and justified'. *Lord Altrincham*, also writing in *Peace News*, attacked the idea, saying that pacifism 'seems to be staging a come-back—in a new and rather disconcerting form', arguing that non-violent resistance could not be effective against totalitarianism. *Fenner Brockway, M.P.*, replying to Lord Altrincham, wrote that part of the solution to the present danger was 'to find a method of resistance to aggression, to invasion and to alien domination which does not rely on weapons of physical destruction'. 'A Britain which developed an effective unarmed method of resistance would have no fear of a nuclear attack: an invading Russia would not want to occupy a graveyard. Is there such a method? Certainly there is enough evidence to justify an enquiry.' If the call for a Royal Commission were refused, he asked for 'an influentially manned *ad hoc* Commission'.

In a world in which any course had risks, Sir Stephen's proposal presented an opportunity which 'ought to be seized with both hands', wrote the prominent Methodist clergyman, *Dr Donald Soper*.

Forty members of Parliament met Sir Stephen at the House of Commons to discuss the proposal on 29 May. The meeting, under an all-party whip, was sponsored by two Labour M.P.s, *Frank Ailawa* and *Reg. Mear*, and by *Jo Grimond*, the Liberal leader. Mr Grimond has yet to declare himself publicly on the proposal. 'I claim we are faced today with an absolutely new defence problem', Sir Stephen told the M.P.s. It was now impossible for defence by physical means to any longer 'keep one jump ahead of the attack'. Therefore, 'the only move open is to burst through the barrier into the psychological and spiritual field' and consider a basis of defence by non-military means.

Reginald Thompson, war correspondent, military strategist and author of *Cry Kares* wrote on 31 May that he wholeheartedly supported the proposal for an enquiry and would support the policy if it were adopted, despite his being a non-pacifist. 'Non-violent resistance may be the only way out, and the need is urgent in the extreme', he said. *Commander Thomas Fox-Pitt* supported an enquiry also, but thought that pacifistic warfare in face of an actual invasion ought to be considered by the enquiry commission as a policy to supplement a non-violent policy in foreign

affair. *Donald W. Hoole, M.P.*, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the British section of the Liberal International, on 7 June called the proposal for an enquiry 'a very interesting one and certainly deserves serious consideration'.

There should be an investigation, wrote *Jay Miskanda, M.P.*, on 7 June, of whether 'the best thing to be in the h-bomb age is a valueless target, *i.e.*, a country that no-one would waste an h-bomb on—a country which could be defended but which nobody would want to defeat because it wouldn't be worth the effort of holding down'. Mr Miskanda is a member of the Labour Party's Executive Committee. He thought an authoritative enquiry should be held and its answers should be public. It was possible that 'such an enquiry might save this country and the world'. *Attorney Robert S. W. Pollock* pointed out: 'It is difficult to count a public enquiry without being open to the charge that the opposition arises from fear of what the Royal Commission might recommend'. *S Sydney Silverman, M.P.*, then a member of the Executive Committee of the Labour Party, on 7 June wrote that Sir Stephen deserved 'the thanks of all responsible citizens for facing democratic society, indeed civilised society in any form, with a challenge it cannot evade'. He asked: 'But if the world can, out of practical necessity, accept in relation to this evil weapon a truth which it rejected when it came only on logic and ethics, will it not be bound to accept it of all weapons? And if it does not, how long will it or could it renounce the use of one weapon alone?'.

The Catholic Herald joined the discussion in an editorial on 7 June. 'Can we not conceive', asked the weekly, 'a Power, genuinely "great", not because it possesses a tremendous armory of nuclear, atomic and conventional weapons, but because it is determined to display a moral influence commensurate with the peoples' traditions, experience, values which it may represent?'. 'If it is argued that powers of actual resistance there must be, then there is the possibility of non-violent, or civilian resistance, at present being advocated by Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall....' The editorial said there was 'little hope' that non-violent resistance against 'a determined Soviet Russia' would be effective, but maintained that 'it is arguable that the deterrent effect of a third world "moral force", resolved on every means of civilian and non-violent resistance, if the worst came to the worst, would hardly be less than the U.S.A.'s nuclear and atomic weapons'. In present conditions, Great Britain and the Commonwealth, acting in unison with Western Europe, could realise 'Great Power' status infinitely more effectively by moral influence than by being a very bad third in the nuclear race. 'Nor have we any doubt that such a policy... would receive the blessing of the

Holy See and the great religious leaders of the world'—it would also prove the best means of ending the nuclear race.

The *Manchester Guardian* in a lengthy editorial on 11 June joined the spreading discussion, declaring: 'Even for those who are less gloomy than Sir Stephen about the effectiveness of the deterrent in the next few years, the proposal seems worth support'. If any of the possible developments of modern weapons were to emerge, 'the alternative of non-violent resistance might be, as Sir Stephen suggests, the best means to defend our way of life. An enquiry, at any rate, seems a cheap precaution.' 'The enquiry is not one which a Government could readily undertake. It would be less embarrassing if organised by non-official bodies.' The editorial concluded: 'An enquiry into non-violent resistance would have to consider whether it could be so persuasive [as the hydrogen bomb and the nuclear missile]—and, if not, whether people in Britain are ready for the suffering which a struggle with the apparatus of a police state would bring'.

Count Michael de la Bédoyère, Editor of the *Catholic Herald*, wrote in *Peace News* on 14 June: 'It would be hypocritical on my part to pretend that I can really resolve my own dilemma: I believe that the h-bomb is incompatible with Christianity; but I also believe in the right to self-defence against materialistic barbarism. This is why I am deeply interested in any serious study of the techniques of "non-violent resistance" as a possible answer'.

Henry Uphove, M.P., Honorary Secretary of the Parliamentary Group for World Government, also on 14 June, wrote: 'If Mr Macmillan's Government were to adopt N.V.R. in place of its present nuclear policy, I am sure it would succeed as a defence mechanism'. 'But if we did adopt N.V.R. here, what would be the effect on, say, Germany, Italy, France? In the long run local national N.V.R.s in those countries would probably break the heart of an invader or of any unpopular Communist dictatorship and to that end our example might help.' He had, however, reservations: 'A curious disadvantage of passive resistance stems from the fact that it is so effective; it can be used not only to frustrate the will of an alien invader and his quaking henchmen but also by any determined political minority objecting to its own government.' He felt that a Royal Commission ought also to consider the alternative of world government, which might be more conducive to preserving order and keeping the country more easily governed democratically.

The Editor of the *New Statesman*, Kingsley Martin, in that journal

on 15 June, wrote: 'Since we have it officially in the *White Paper* that no military defence is possible against nuclear weapons, and since nobody believes that "the great deterrent" can give more than a few years' safety, why not at least consider whether there is not some non-military form of defence?' 'It might be possible, as some have suggested in correspondence and articles that have followed in papers as widely various as the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Carlisle Herald* and *Peace News*, to hold such an inquiry without official support.'

Professor G.D.H. Cole, on 21 June, agreed that there was no justification for the use of nuclear weapons and there was no defence against them, but felt that 'our task is not to defend ourselves against such attack, but to prevent it'. He said the main task should be 'to be seeking ways of breaking down the tension between the major powers and of presenting agreed measures of disarmament and the renunciation of armed force as a means of pursuing their several objectives'.

Christopher Hollis also joined the discussion on 21 June. Mr Hollis is a former Conservative M.P., a member of the Editorial Board of *The Tablet*, also a Roman Catholic weekly, and of the Board of *Punch*. He said: 'I quite agree with Commander King-Hall that the possibilities of a pacifist foreign policy should be coolly considered . . .' A selfish kind of pacifism could be of no help, he said, but 'there is the pacifism which is truly determined to bring peace and to preserve freedom for the world. Pacifism of that sort may well conquer in the end if it is prepared for immediate suffering and poverty and has the courage to accept them.' Three other statements of support were published on 21 June: *Aldous Huxley* stated that 'Sir Stephen King-Hall's article strikes me as admirably sensible and lucid. . .'. *Basil Davidson*, author and member of the editorial staff of the *Daily Herald*, said: 'I hope for my part that King-Hall's proposal will receive serious and wide consideration, and, in the end, official acceptance'. *Rog. Moor, M.P.*, said that in face of possible universal destruction 'a new method of resisting evil must be found' and 'men and women of goodwill should study what alternative means are possible. The King-Hall suggestion is appropriate and may serve to bring hope to a world made hopeless by military fury'. *Gerald Gardner, Q.C.*, wrote: 'In my opinion, if we have any duty to future generations, we cannot afford to ignore any possible alternative to the development of nuclear weapons, and on these grounds I strongly support his request for such an enquiry'.

The Associate Editor of *Peace News*, *J. Allen Skipper*, on 28 June, commented on Henry Osborne's article, pointing out that 'the method

of armed warfare conditions the society that accepts and prepares for it. equally the acceptance of the idea of non-violence must radically change the character of the society that embraces it". Non-violent resistance, he wrote, 'implies a conception of democratic action in which decisions are brought as closely as possible into the hands of the people whose conditions they affect' and which is 'particularly sensitive to minority rights in matters that are the primary concern of the minorities in question'. 'As a means of defence it is, of course, impossible if it is steadfastly adhered to, and it is this factor that enables it to give its own particular content to the word "democracy"'. 'It is only in a world in which men have learned to protect their own values by non-violent resistance to oppression that such a Leviathan as a World State becomes tolerable of contemplation.'

While the House of Lords were debating the Air Estimates on 10 July, the *Bishop of Manchester* unexpectedly entered the discussion. He called the hydrogen bomb 'a plague', declaring, 'I believe . . . that in no circumstances whatsoever would it be right to use this weapon . . .'. The present dangers, he believed, 'may possibly best be met not in the realm of defence at all'. 'It will be within the knowledge of noble Lords that Sir Stephen King-Hall has publicly raised the general question of the use and utility of non-violent resistance, whether as a substitute for or as a supplement to armed resistance. This, among others, is the kind of question that, in my view, requires dispassionate consideration.' The Bishop insisted he was not a pacifist, but believed that 'defence problems should be considered in a much wider sense'. He favoured an investigation.

Mr John Hare, then Secretary of State for the Army, was questioned by a journalist at a press conference on 24 July concerning the unarmoured defence inquiry proposal. The press conference dealt with the army re-organization plans 'which are necessary to keep it abreast of changing circumstances, politics, weapons, and techniques of war'. The journalist referred to the sentence in Mr Hare's report, and said: 'It has been argued that nuclear weapons have completely changed the defence problem. You may be aware that Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall has proposed that in the light of this, a Royal Commission or other responsible body should be created to examine the possibilities of unarmoured defence or non-violent resistance as a national defence policy. If such a body were to be created, would you be prepared to give it your full co-operation?' Clearly taken off-guard, the Secretary of State for War hesitatingly replied that he felt the question was 'not particularly relevant'. The journalist, however, returned with a supplementary.

'But I have based this upon the premise of your re-organisation. If there are no longer military means capable of defending this country, then surely the question is irrelevant.' Mr Hare then replied, 'I am afraid that I do not share Commander Stephen King-Hall's proposal'.

Roman Catholic Archbishop T.O. Roberts, Archbishop of Bombay, 1937-1950, wrote on 2 August that Sir Stephen had not made 'extravagant claims for "defence by passive resistance" such as have at times brought upon it discredit and incredulity; his *Reflections on Defence* start from the hard facts accepted by the British Government's *White Paper on Defence*—that the apparatus for defence is out of date and beyond our means'. While not rejecting all violence and self-defence, His Grace said: 'The world-wide educational campaign advocated by Sir Stephen King-Hall might cost the millions envisaged by him and be a profitable investment as armaments have seldom been. His own example of courage in stating novel and unpopular truths—and in this I am quoting a distinguished General—is perhaps his most valuable contribution to the educational campaign.' During World War II, His Grace corresponded with Gandhi concerning the rigorous conditions essential to a 'just war', and told him that no-one could read such a Christian indictment of modern war as that contained in the book by the Dominican priest Father Strummann 'without conceiving profound sympathy for the alternative he [Gandhi] offered'.

The *Liverpool Daily Post* carried an article by Sir Stephen on 6 August, 'We Need to Break Through the Thought Barrier', in which he expressed his basic proposals. The paper replied editorially on 9 August. Dr George Mackenzie, then Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, speaking at Aberdeen referred to Sir Stephen's call for a Royal Commission. 'There is one thing mightier than arms', he said, 'an idea whose time has come'.

When the annual *Labour Party Conference* met at Brighton at the end of September 1952, two of the 443 resolutions on its agenda were related to Sir Stephen's proposal. One, offered by the *Berwick and East Lothian Constituency Labour Party*, mentioned exploration of non-violent resistance among several proposed anti-war steps. The other, offered by the *Perthshire (South) Constituency Labour Party*, specifically called for a Royal Commission to investigate the matter. Prior to the Conference, several prominent Labour Party members had endorsed the following statement. 'We strongly recommend that all Constituency Labour Parties give serious consideration to supporting Resolution no. 142 for the Annual Conference of the Labour Party proposed by the Ports-

mouth (South) Constituency Labour Party. It reads: "This Conference calls for a Royal Commission to be set up to consider the possibilities of unarmed resistance as a national defence policy . . ." The signatories were Anthony Wedgwood Benn, M.P., Basil Davidson, Dr David Saper, *Former Brockway M.P.*, Frank Allan, M.P., George Criddick, M.P., Leslie Hale, M.P., S. Sydney Sherman, M.P., George Thomas, M.P., and Henry Ubborah, M.P. The Portsmouth South delegate, Mr J. Miller, was ready to move the resolution, and the delegate from Berwick and East Lothian Constituency Labour Party was set to second the motion. At least 12 other delegates hoped to speak on its behalf. However, the conference procedures prevented the motion getting to the floor.

The Labour Peace Fellowship's pre-conference manifesto contained a call for unilateral disarmament and the substitution of a defence policy based on non-violent resistance. The alternative to hydrogen bombs, said the manifesto, 'is non-violent resistance to oppression. As King-Hall says: 'humanity must break the thought barrier if we are to avoid extinction. Non-violent resistance has many victories to its credit, including the struggle for Indian freedom under Gandhi's leadership.' A similar policy statement on unarmed defence was made in the Labour Peace Fellowship's 1958 manifesto.



An audience of British Army, Navy and Air Force officers heard Sir Stephen's lecture on 9 October at the Royal United Services Institution on *The Alternative to the Nuclear Dilemma: Non-violent Resistance*. Admiral Sir Guy Russell, Commandant of the Imperial Defence College, at the close of the lecture expressed the thanks of the audience to the lecturer and the chairman, Rear-Admiral Sir Anthony Surnard. Admiral Russell was one of the former Commanders-in-Chief in the audience. Another was Field-Marshal Auchinleck. The Royal United Services Institution, membership of which is open to serving officers of Her Majesty's forces, is incorporated by Royal Charter for the promotion and advancement of naval and military science and literature.

Sir Stephen began his lecture by quoting Mr Sandys's statement that there is no possible defence against nuclear attack. He insisted that, though he respected there, he did not share the moral view of pacifists. He had, however, concluded that 'orthodox thinking about war, and hence defence, is radically wrong . . . A completely fresh look at the whole business' was needed. 'You can't lose a nuclear war,

you can't win it, you can only leave as its memorial a civilisation destroyed."

Sir Stephen did not on principle reject the use of military force. But whether 'military force can serve its traditional function of beating off an enemy military aggression' was subject to one condition. 'The condition is this: "The force needed to be used must not be so destructive that the material and moral disadvantages of its use are on balance greater than the material and moral benefits expected to be achieved by the use of force". Put it another way: "It's no good burning down the house to roast the pig".'

Sir Stephen then turned to his alternative. It was worth looking into the idea that 'the United Kingdom should make a unilateral declaration that it will make no use of nuclear energy for military purposes'. But this was not as simple as it might seem. The U.S. and Canada would probably not agree. 'NATO, as we know it, would be wound up. Obviously we could have American nuclear forces in Britain. NATO could be replaced by E.T.O.', he suggested, 'a European Treaty Organisation pledged not to use nuclear energy for military purposes'. Against a nuclear power 'conventional forces of any size' are 'useless'. 'Therefore, we shall soon discover that the only conventional forces which had any logical purpose would be those needed for internal security and, in our case, overseas police operations.' This would mean a saving of £1,000,000,000 on defence. But it would also mean the possibility of an enemy occupation. For this event—which was possible now even in terms of conventional war—there were now no preparations. There were none because 'defence thinking was, and is, in this matter of a thoroughly defeatist character'. Occupation should be regarded only as a tactical defeat, not the end of the struggle, which 'should not be continued by military means which *a priori* have failed, but by moral and political forces'.

'But we do not know enough about the techniques of non-violent resistance with or without association with guerrilla warfare, to which I do not attach much importance in the case of the U.K.' Detailed study of past non-violent resistance from the defence angle was needed. 'So that even if we do not adopt a defence policy based on the idea of renouncing the use of nuclear energy for military purposes—a decision which by a kind of chain-reaction in reverse would lead to unilateral disarmament—we ought to give thought of how to defend our way of life against an occupying enemy.' He concluded 'I sometimes dream and even hope that my country, which has made such notable contributions in

the past to the totality of modern civilization, may perform the supreme service of giving man a lead which will save him from himself."

Commenting on Sir Stephen's proposals, following the lecture, *Rear-Admiral Sir Anthony Buzzard, C.B., D.S.O., O.B.E.*, former British Director of Naval Intelligence, said that this "very important question" should be "thoroughly investigated". Admiral Buzzard made it clear, however, that he did not accept Sir Stephen's premise that a 'limited' war must inevitably lead to total nuclear war. The Admiral is one of the leading advocates of the theory of 'limited war'—that the destructiveness of a nuclear war can be limited if there is agreement in advance between the combatants that in the event of war only certain types of weapons (including some nuclear ones) would be used and then under specified conditions. He admitted that if we continued the policy of 'over-emphasizing' the h-bomb, 'and accordingly decreasing our preparation for limited wars, then we might ultimately find ourselves in a position where non-violent resistance might be the only right policy. That is to say, if we go on offering our public, and the uncommitted countries (which we are also trying to defend) an "all or nothing" choice of defeat with our small and decreasing conventional weapons, or suicide with the h-bomb, then they may well lean increasingly towards pacifism and non-violent resistance, and in the event of a threat may well choose surrender and Communist occupation.'

If defeat with conventional weapons and suicide with the h-bomb were the only alternatives then it would 'be right to choose surrender and non-violent resistance, for by any ethical, legal or political standards that [Communist occupation] would be a far lesser evil than total global war with modern weapons'. He believed that the 'crucial gap' between conventional war and total nuclear war could be filled, and that it could be done more quickly and effectively than by trying to organize the whole Western world for a policy of non-violent resistance for any Communist aggression with superior conventional forces.

"This, however, does not mean that I think there is no case for non-violent resistance at all", he continued. Although he thought that a 'clear distinction between tactical atomic and total war' would provide the best chance of preventing and limiting war, 'I still admit that there is always a possibility of such a situation getting out of hand and of its drifting towards total global war'. If so, and if negotiations failed, "then I believe that rather than fight war to a finish and destroy civilization, it would be better to cease fire and resort to non-violent resistance for such a war could not be 'the lesser of any evils'. "I therefore", Admiral Buzzard

concluded, 'support the lecturer's view that this terribly important question should be thoroughly investigated, but I submit it should not only be investigated on the basis of military, political and economic expediency, but also on the basis of Christian ethics, morality and legality, for they, too, are surely a great part of the way of life which we are at such pains to defend'.

Mr George Brown, P.C., M.P., then the Labour Party's 'Shadow' Defence Minister, speaking at University College, London, in early November, on *'Defence in the Nuclear Age'* felt it necessary to spend over half of his time trying to dismiss the case for non-violent resistance as a defence policy. 'You could clearly make an intellectual case for a policy of passive resistance', he said, 'but I reject that this is a valid course, both for intellectual and personal reasons'. 'If little nations want to retain their independence and have any say, they have to reject the theory of passive resistance, which is too negative. For us to be passive is to hand over the direction of affairs to Russia or America—and I am not even altogether happy about the latter—and there could be no leadership for the values we seek to defend', he asserted.

A 45-minute broadcast on the BBC Home Service on 19 December was focused on the question. Commander King-Hall spoke briefly to the *Fifty-One Club* on *'Heresy in Defence: The Strategy of Non-violence'*. In the discussion, one speaker said: 'We have heard the voice of sanity, which is all too rare nowadays'. Another felt Sir Stephen was living in a cloud-cuckoo land of his own and that there was no hope of successful resistance in case of a Russian invasion. 'I am still, in matters of this kind, as gregarious a devotee of defensive warfare as the ancient Greeks were when faced with the Persian threat'. Another: 'If you are prepared to use the hydrogen bomb, you are prepared to abandon all moral concepts'. A further view: 'The British people must break with NATO and the American alliance and take up a positive neutrality, taking the new initiative alongside India and the uncommitted nations in Asia'. The *Bishop of Manchester* used non-violent resistance 'must come not from Staff Colleges, but from the very depths of human nature. It is not simply a matter of instructing people, but involves a sweeping social change in this country'. *Richard Wainwright*: 'Sir Stephen... has shown that the alternative to violence is not inactivity, he has pointed the only way which can be any good at all'.

The Minister of Defence, Mr Duncan Sandys, was questioned on the proposal at a press conference in mid-February 1958, following his statement in the House of Commons on similar bases. The journalist asked:

'In the light of the admittedly very grave dangers involved in this policy, would you be prepared to consider a radically different defence policy such as that envisaged by Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall in his call for a Royal Commission on non-violent resistance as a defence policy?'. Mr Sandys replied that the question was outside the scope of the conference, but the journalist pointed out that it was related to the dangers involved in the inside policy being discussed. 'I have a very great respect for Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall . . .', said Mr Sandys. 'He is an old friend of mine'. He felt, however, that many questions of foreign policy could be related in some way to the subject, and that he ought not to comment on Sir Stephen's proposals. 'I think we would be in very deep water if we extend the scope of this conference.'

+

Wide press attention greeted the publication by Victor Gollancz, in March 1958, of Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall's book, *Defence in the Nuclear Age*, elaborating his segment. Military historian Noble Frankland, writing in the *Observer* (9 March), said that in the situation produced by nuclear weapons, Sir Stephen's proposals 'whether they command support or not, deserve to be differentiated from those of the ordinary run of isolation-mongers'. The training of the British people 'for passive resistance and for moral offensive' would, however, 'be liable to produce a most un-British way of life'. Mr Frankland felt that the author had taken a too heroic view of human nature, and that the British way of life 'may have a better, or at least a longer, prospect under the admittedly dangerous conditions of the nuclear stalemate than under those of the suggested aggressive moral war against the Communist ideology'.

A long feature article on the book by 'A.H.'—presumably *H. Alunau Hetherington*, the Editor—appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* (10 March). 'Each of Sir Stephen's proposals—to abandon the H-bomb unilaterally, to conduct active political warfare, and to prepare for non-violent resistance in case of occupation—has merits and each has defects', said the writer. Concerning non-violent defence, he asked: 'Can democratic ideas survive the destruction of parliamentary government, of an independent judiciary, and of a free press?'. On non-cooperation: 'The idea is noble but how long can people hold out? The parallel that Sir Stephen draws with India and Irish experience are not valid, because at Westminster there was a strong and articulate opposition to repressive policies; there will be none in Moscow. Parallels with Norway are invalid because its people always had the hope of liberation, and with the

Ruhr because the remainder of Germany was not occupied. Resistance in Britain would call for still greater moral and physical effort than in any of these, and for its maintenance through two or three generations.' Sir Stephen's claim that the h-bomb is not effective as a deterrent was challenged by the reviewer, but there were dangers in the spreading of its possession to other countries. 'To prevent that proliferation, the most practical course is for Britain to offer to renounce her bombs', though she could keep American protection. If, however, when freed by the development of long-range rockets from the need for overseas bases, the U.S. returned to isolationism, the situation for Britain would be changed. 'In that event, non-violent resistance could offer an alternative defence. Here is the chief value of Sir Stephen's book.'

Comment in the *Daily Mirror* (11 March) rejected unilateral renunciation of the h-bomb. 'Giving the Russians notice that we prefer enslavement to suicide . . . would encourage them to impose their monstrous Communist regime on these islands exactly when it suited them.' 'Don't let's discuss and prepare for the servitude of this country before it arrives.' The *Sun's* reviewer (18 March) said: 'Many will not agree with Sir Stephen's views and conclusions, but they will be very interested in his approach to a subject causing widespread anxiety today.' The *Daily Worker* attacked the book editorially (22 March), without mentioning either the proposed unilateral nuclear disarmament or non-violent resistance. In presenting the alternatives as the h-bomb or the possibilities of occupation, Sir Stephen had offered 'a false alternative'. Peaceful co-existence could 'only' come by 'agreement between all the Great Powers'. The *Daily Herald* carried an entirely descriptive review. The *New Chronicle's* reviewer in an attack full of ridicule on the book dismissed the discussion of non-violent resistance, saying, 'Honestly, it is hard to take this seriously'. 'If we abandoned our alliances, military and economic occupation would be certain. The Bomb, however, is a risk and no more.' Michael Fox, Editor of *Tribune*, writing in that paper (14 March), felt that the picture of present world problems was presented in 'too harsh and dogmatic terms'. He called the book 'the most devastating exposure yet published of the British Government's defence strategy'. The 'facts, arguments and original thought' in the book 'deserve to be pondered deeply by everyone engaged in the greatest of all debates'.

The *New Statesman's* reviewer (15 March), *Michael Howard*, lecturer on military history at King's College, paid tribute to Sir Stephen's 'utmost intelligence, resolute political courage and independence, and an original, slightly mischievous cast of mind' as being better qualifications than 'the most humiliating staff-college record' for analysing the problem of

nuclear armaments. However, he rejected the author's thesis as being 'as inapplicable to the nuclear as to any other age'. He then criticised him on three points: The British way of life is dependent on armed power; the Russians could accomplish their objectives without occupation; and some of Sir Stephen's thinking about the future is naive. Sir Stephen's projection of 'a besieged Britain living on its own resources, the centre of world attention... and a renaissance of national purpose and unity far exceeding those stirring days... when Great Britain stood alone after Dunkirk' is dismissed as not the type of extremes by which 'such policies are evolved, in the field of defence or anything else'.

The *Daily Telegraph's* long review (10 March) by *Pergrine Warshawer* carefully summarised Sir Stephen's proposals for disarmament and defence by non-violent resistance, and then called his proposed solution 'plain moonshine'. 'I just do not see the peoples of Western Europe, or of Britain, being able to deal with a Soviet invasion in the way Sir Stephen suggests.' Russia could dominate Western Europe without invasion, and in case of invasion an economic siege could halt any plans for non-violent resistance. The Russians would be far more ruthless than the British were against Gandhi. The reviewer preferred the *motus quo* in defence. *Richard Scott* in *The Laureate* (13 March) wrote that 'many people are likely to find his analysis of the consequences of the use of nuclear weapons both logical and realistic, fewer will probably be persuaded that his proposals for meeting this new situation are politically practicable'.

The proposed 'elaborate, government-organised and nation-wide program' of non-violent resistance 'which could be put into operation the moment the Soviet forces landed on our shores', appeared to the reviewer to be in 'the realm of fantasy'. The book was, however, 'a serious contribution to any discussion of what is probably the most perplexing and appalling problem with which the modern world has been faced'.

The reviewer in *The Times* (13 March) called it 'a deeply honest, if misguided book' in an article headed '*Long or wheezy?*'. The proposed non-violent resistance, said the reviewer, postulated 'a degree of restraint by the oppressed Britons that is hardly implied in our rough island history'. If Sir Stephen 'believes that the human race is too foolish to limit its conflicts, even to avoid suicide, why does he assume that a section of it is sensible enough to accept the greater restraints involved in passive resistance?' The *Times Literary Supplement* (14 March) in a highly critical review said that 'his timely tract may stimulate thought' and that 'his book can be judged only as a more or less effective piece of

gamboling'. 'Going through the thought barrier' (one of Sir Stephen's phrases) gets readers 'in the mental world that has hitherto been the exclusive area of the pacifist'. The section on 'Defence Without Arms', and the reviewer, was the least convincing. The pacifist case had not yet been proved, and nations had been destroyed by successive occupations as effectively as by bombs. 'Peace has been maintained over long periods by the balance of power; and it is said that a man of Sir Stephen's influence and ability should now set to upset it in favour of chaos'.

The Rev. Michael Scott, renowned for his work on behalf of African freedom, writing in *Peace News* on 14 March said that 'Sir Stephen's appeal is not to fear or emotion but to reason in a world hordering on hysteria'. He felt, however, that there was a need even more urgent than 'organised non-violence to defend our way of life'. 'There is the urgent need for a new revolutionary movement which will have the courage and incentive to use methods of non-violent resistance not only against the manufacture of nuclear weapons but against oppressive legislation and violations of human rights and natural justice.' A movement capable of a strong 'effectual fight against oppression and injustice', ignorance and poverty was needed. 'Despite the undoubted advances of humanitarianism in the fields of health, education and welfare, our age has at the same time born an age of the planned torture and destruction of millions of human beings by people captivated by a myth and driven to hysteria by propaganda.' If Mr Sandys's statement that only bomber bases would be defended was boldness, then 'we need an even bolder leadership for peace'.

Freder Brockway, M.P., in *Peace News* (21 March), said: 'I am not entirely a pacifist, but I share Commander King-Hall's view that, with the emergence of nuclear weapons, war must be altogether renounced. I would retain only a police force. I believe Britain would exert a greater influence for all that is good in the world if she gave this example, and she would certainly be safer from destruction. In the unlikely event of foreign occupation, I am sure that non-violent resistance could be organised with progressively rising effect. British experience in democracy, in local administration, in the trades unions, in every voluntary aspect of our life, is so long and wide and deep that a policy of non-cooperation with an unacceptable top-level administration would make it permanently impossible.' However, he rejected Sir Stephen's proposal for a world-wide propaganda campaign against Communism, preferring the example of liberty as the most effective way to spread it. It was also

'inconsistent with the policy of peaceful co-existence and the progressive realisation of internationally-agreed disarmament'.

Reynold Thompson, writing in *Peace News* (28 March) declared: 'I know of no more savage indictment of all that remains of the dregs of Western Civilization than that it should be necessary to plead for the abandonment of the policies of genocide, race suicide and the extermination of the future, on the grounds of expediency. Yet the moral and spiritual and political bankruptcy of our country makes this demand. Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall has performed the difficult service of stating a case against the use of "extermination as a threat or "deterrent" which has disentangled it from the moral and spiritual issue. The result must be compared to a body deprived of heart and soul. But we must be grateful.' He doubted the reality of a Communist threat, but assuming its reality, believed that Soviet Communism would not survive 'for five years dilated with and in close contact with the peoples of Western Europe. Nor do the leaders of Soviet Russia believe otherwise. To them our "idea" is an even more dangerous plague than their "idea" is to us. Soviet Russia, in the unlikely event of their attacking us or occupying us, would have a hopeless task on their hands.' The moral worth of the West was at too low an ebb—Hiroshima, Nagasaki, atomic weapons, the gas chambers, Belsen, Dachau, exterminating 6,000,000 Jews, rapists in Korea—for a British disarmament example to make much moral impact. Fascism was a more potent danger to democracy than Communism. 'Even now the vital force is dangerously missing from our democracy.' 'I do not believe that the world will be saved by pleading with the masses for sanity . . . The world will be saved by a miracle, by an act of faith. Or it will perish.'

John Banks, a British Army Major during World War II, now Chairman of the National Committee of the Common Wealth Party, writing in *Peace News* (28 March), discussed some of Sir Stephen's views on the conduct of non-violent resistance. 'He rightly points out that practically no study has been made of the effective way for an occupied population to react to the occupying forces, either in this country or the continent.' Turning to the social implications of non-violent resistance, Mr Banks wrote: 'He does no more than hint at the decentralisation of political and economic power that would be necessary outcomes of such preparations. But we may be sure that some of the more deep-seated opposition to his thesis will come from this very realisation on the part of those who today rule, or hope to rule, our British centralised State.'

Military strategist *Capt. B.H. Liddell Hart* wrote, in *Reynolds News*

(9 March): 'It is remarkable and deeply significant that a man so combative by temperament and heredity should become a leading advocate of non-violent resistance'. 'Arguments for abjuring force have no clear a moral basis that, in a country where Christian or humane ethics prevail, they start with a moral advantage over arguments for defence by violent means. Their appeal becomes all the stronger when the main means of "defence" is a weapon of indiscriminate massacre. Even on practical grounds there is a stronger case for non-violence than is generally realised. But its advocates are inclined to overlook the fact that its main successes have been obtained against opponents whose code of morality was fundamentally similar, and whose ruthlessness was thereby restrained. It is very doubtful whether non-violent resistance would have availed against a Tartar conqueror in the past, or against a Stalin in more recent times. The only impression it seems to have made on Hitler was to excite his impulse to trample on what, to his mind, was contemptible weakness—although there is evidence that it did embarrass many of his generals, brought up in a better code, and baffled them more than the violent resistance movements in occupied countries. But the practice of non-violent resistance against a government, by members of a religious or political movement that is cohesive in spirit, is a different matter from its use by a nation in a conflict of States. To offer any good chance of success here, it not only requires a higher collective discipline and fortitude than any army has attained, but requires this level to be attained by the nation as a whole. The effectiveness of non-violent resistance is undermined if even a small proportion of the community play into the opponent's hand—through weakness, self-interest or pugnacity. An examination of the course that King-Hall has espoused leaves two main doubts about its practicability as a national policy. The first is whether the nation as a whole, or any likely Government, could be persuaded to embark on such a revolutionary experiment. The second is whether the policy could be effectively practised and fulfilled by a *serieux*—sincere human instincts such as fear, anger, and selfishness could all too easily wreck its prospects. These are the underlying difficulties of the non-violent or pacifist solution—but we are still left with the problem, which is vital and urgent.'

Sir Richard Acland, former Member of Parliament who resigned from the House of Commons in 1955 in protest against the h-bomb, writing in Peace News (21 March), said: 'King-Hall, by the very fact of not making the pacifist case, has said to everyone under thirty: Now look about this; for while you are still in the prime of life it is perfectly

possible that public policy may be revolutionised'. 'The book comes at exactly the right time and will open up the great debate which will be the main theme of public controversy for the next 20 years. Writing with a certain amount of experience of these matters, I would say that unless my friends of Victory for Socialism can quite soon win their internal victory (within the Labour Party), there will be ample time and means to start from scratch and build up the entire new political apparatus that will be needed to attend to the political side of the work that has to be done.' 'As there will not ever be any other public campaign, if this one fails', pacifists and non-pacifists should work together in such a campaign.

+

There has now been a period for Sir Stephen's proposal to spread and be absorbed in people's thinking. He is not a man who will let such a matter rest, and we can be certain that before long there will be new developments in this debate. That this debate on a subject formerly often considered esoteric has taken place among such prominent persons is in itself deeply significant. Even a year prior to Sir Stephen's proposal, few people would have thought this type of suggestion could receive so serious a consideration. In view of the perils of nuclear weapons, the pace of change may seem to many slow. But considering the vast distance modern man may have to travel to achieve a peaceful free world, and the barriers to such a change, the pace may be moving rapidly indeed.

Whether one agrees with Sir Stephen or not, it is most difficult to argue against investigating his suggested alternative to nuclear weapons. The debate has indicated that the idea of non-violent resistance has spread wider and deeper into people's thinking than has often been realised. It has also shown that very little is really known about this phenomenon which seems to be occurring with increasing frequency throughout the world. It is possible, now that some social scientists are turning their attention to this subject, that more light will be thrown on it in the coming years.

One reason that Sir Stephen's suggestion has received more serious consideration than have prior calls for total unilateral disarmament may be that he has proposed not simply renouncing military power as the main method of defence, but replacing it with an alternative. Whatever the dangers of military defence, without it people may feel impotent and

helpless. As Cecil Hirstshaw has put it: "... people cannot live in a vacuum and will continue to rationalise an old error until a positive and hopeful alternative can be found¹². Whether the British peoples will decide that non-violent resistance is that alternative will depend on various factors. These include whether or not they gain increased understanding of the subject, as the result of study or observation (it is possible this method may become fairly widely used in the campaign in Britain for unilateral nuclear disarmament). Also important is whether they come to feel either that the deterrent effect to invasion of this method of resistance is at least as great as that of nuclear weapons, or that somehow non-violent resistance is possible against a totalitarian regime.

After living in Britain for two years and a half, the writer is convinced that the peoples of that island—English, Scots and Welsh—are capable of many of the qualities which non-violent resistance requires: for example, courage, determination in the face of possible defeat, love of freedom, heroism. There is a widespread belief that the peoples of Britain have led the world in the past and shall do so in the future. Perhaps they will come upon a new way to do this. The upsurge of indignation among a major section of the population at the time of the Suez invasion, and the depth of feeling against nuclear weapons (illustrated, for example, by the four-day march to the Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Research Establishment) are indications that a rejection of modern armed might may be the way this conviction in world leadership will take form in the next twenty years. The peoples of Britain are, of course, subject to many of the traits and forces widespread in Western Civilization today. It is possible that they may move closer to the society envisaged in Huxley's *Brave New World*, or even Orwell's *1984*, than to a non-violent society. It is, however, at least equally possible that a program based on Sir Stephen's proposal will eventually be adopted. There may be other alternatives. But whatever the eventual outcome, it must be noted that when a proposal such as Sir Stephen's can receive widespread and serious consideration, there exist in that society the beginnings of basic change.

12. Hirstshaw, *Op. cit.*, p. 4.

The Importance of Vows

A Correspondence

25 October 1910.

My dear Bhopāl,

I am unable to see eye to eye with you as regards the 'Importance of Vows'. So I am going to exercise the privilege of an impudent little boy towards his dad and with blunt frankness set forth my view, and I am sure you will not spare the rod if you found it necessary—non-violent though you may be.

I believe, spiritually and morally all men are not alike. A few are advanced, but most are mainly followers of leaders. Men in different stages need different methods of guidance and leadership. I believe this is acknowledged by most religions and especially by Hinduism, which approves of idolatry for those who are at the lower end of the scale. If I mistake not, you yourself are not averse to the use of idols by those who are unable to conceive God without material representation. Just as idols are means by which we seek to attain an end and help out those in the lower stages of development, so are vows means by which leaders strive to hold up to the highest resolve the actions of their followers. The general run of men are not always constant in their spiritual strength and vision. Sometimes they reach a high level, but do not maintain that level for long. A vow is a device or a religious observance calculated to keep such persons up to their highest light. If you gather together a large number of people and explain to them high ideals of life, which may be second nature to you but even to conceive which will be difficult to the masses, and when the light dawns on them at that psychological

1. One of the weekly letters written by Gandhi to the inmates of the Sayyidpura Aśram during his imprisonment in 1911. (Continued on page 131.)

moment you ask them to take a vow, so that they will in future act in accordance with that light, then you fix the standard of action for them by that vow. If they had not taken that vow, they would have relapsed into their old ways a little afterwards, having forgotten the high ideals and being unable to conceive these ideals themselves without the help of leaders. This is one of the places of vows in religious observance. There is another function which is like unto this. When a man reaches a high pitch of emotion he declares to the world what his intentions are and this brings to bear upon his actions a certain amount of public opinion which keeps him to his resolve. Vows have also been conceived as a bargain with God. I feel a vow is a helpful crutch, it is a protective hedge; it is a dam to raise the level but it is not the end nor is it of the highest. I personally will not advocate taking vows any more than I would advocate idol worship, although I concede that certain types of people find these aids useful.

Constant application of one's ideals and taking decisions from day to day is all-important in the formation of character. The taking of vows precludes this. A person who has taken a vow ceases sooner or later—and often sooner than later—to appeal to his ideals every time a situation arises; and he acts in a particular way, not because his ideals dictate that course, but because he has taken a vow to act so. A vow emphasises the deed rather than the ideal behind it. The vow-taker is on a moral plane, not on the spiritual. Vows make us mentally lazy. We decide once for all and we lose our moral exercise and in time our moral sense gets palsied. It is a short cut to get people to act in the way leaders will have them act, but it ultimately leads to cultural degeneration. People become too lazy to think for themselves and a mental lethargy creeps in. I feel that vows and blind obedience to custom and authority have had no small share in causing the present degeneration in our country. An apothecary of vows at this time of day is both reactionary and dangerous.

I know vows have an honoured place in most of the old religions—including the Catholics, and to a limited extent, the Protestant Churches—but these are concessions to the weakness of man and find no place in Christ's teaching. It is a decided falling off from the spiritual plane to a moral expediency.

I would not say a vow is a sign of weakness but that it is a device to help the weak. The strong man needs no such help. His ideals, determination and will-power will see him through any situation. Vows take the place of these three controllers of men's actions in those who are not advanced enough.

It is a confusion of ideals to mix up vows with unflinching determination. The vow is a substitute for determination. It seems to me it is almost a blasphemy to identify it with God. The man who obeys the higher law or the inner voice or his ideals and has the strength of character to carry through its dictates moves with a consistency which is more than the mere regularity of the celestial bodies. The sun is not regular because it has taken a vow but because it obeys a higher law. I would claim a higher position for man than even the sun. Vows degrade man to the position of an automaton.

Then, again, there seem to be some inconsistencies. When you say vows can only be taken on points of universally recognized duty which we wish to cultivate the habit of performing, are things like taking cow's milk or unseasoned food of such universal acceptance? Yet you use vows for these and other minor details of every-day life.

If I am allowed a personal reference, I may say I have always abhorred vows. I have never felt the need of a vow or a pledge. When, as a child, my elder brothers who had taken the pledge of Good Templars asked me to join them, I flatly refused, saying, I will not drink because I will not and not because I had taken a pledge not to do so. I have been a member of several Masonic Lodges—and even now I am a member of two—but I have never yet touched a drop of strong drink. I have not succumbed to the very first temptation, as you suggest.

Can it be you are forming a new concept midway between determination and vow, in which case a word has to be coined to express it. I can, of course, explain your advocating vows. Teach the child the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it. You have been brought up as a child to use vows often and at present you are merely rationalizing your practice. When I criticize taking of vows I have not got you in mind but the effect it will have on the ignorant masses.

Kindly let me have your frank reaction to what I have stated above and if you have an objection I should like to collect my thoughts together logically in the form of an article, leaving out all personal references, and publish it in some paper.

I trust you are both well.

With love from

J.C. Kunkrappl.

31 October 1930.

My dear Kamlabhai,

I am glad you have expressed yourself freely on the question of vows. You seem to me to misunderstand my meaning. No fault of yours. You have not the original before you. I have not seen the translation. The word vow is also an unsuitable equivalent for the original 'vrat'. But the best thing for me is to explain what I mean and then leave you to find the exact word if you endorse my position. If you consent it you should continue the correspondence till we have thrashed the subject out. You seem to think of vows publicly administered to audiences. This may or may not be good. The vow I am thinking of is a promise made by one to oneself. We have to deal with two dwellers within. *Rama* and *Kivara*, God and Satan, *Gunsad* and *Ahimsa*. The one binds us to make us really free, and the other only appears to free us so as to bind us tight within his grips. A 'vow' is a promise made to *Rama* to do or not to do a certain thing, which if good we want to do but have not the strength unless we are tied down, and which if bad we would avoid but have not the strength to avoid unless similarly tied down. This I hold to be a condition indispensable of growth. I grant that we are higher than the sun, how much more necessary for us to be at least as true and faithful as the sun, if not truer and more faithful? If in matters of commerce, a man who vacillates is useless, why should he fare otherwise in matters spiritual, which carry with them infinitely greater consequences? If you hold that I must speak and do the right thing at any cost, you grant my whole position and so you also do if you grant that at the peril of my life I should be faithful to my wife or friend. You can easily multiply such instances. For me Jesus was predominantly a man of unshakable resolution, i.e. vows. His yea was yea for ever. A life of vows is like marriage, a sacrament. It is a marriage with God, indissoluble for all time. Come, let us marry Him.

Yours etc.

Love,
BhāṭVeravdi Mandir,
16 November 1930.

My dear Kamlabhai,

If a man makes an unalterable decision to do or not to do a particular thing, it is for me a vow. The strongest men have been known as

times to have become weak. God has a way of confounding us in our strength. Hence the necessity of vows, i.e. invoking God's assistance to give us strength at the crucial moment. But I must not stirre with you. It seems to me that we mean the same thing but express it differently—you in Spanish and I in Italian, shall we say?

Love,

Bipà.

1930 in the Yeravda Central Prison, in which he wrote *interviews* as follows: 'A vow means unflinching determination, and helps us against temptations. Determination is worth nothing if it bends before discomfort. The universal experience of humanity supports the view that progress is impossible without inflexible determination. There cannot be a vow to commit a sin; in the case of a vow, first thought to be mysterious but later found to be unful, there arises a clear necessity to give it up. But no-one takes, or ought to take, vows about dubious matters. Vows can be taken only on points of universally recognised principles. The possibility of sin in such a case is more or less imaginary. A devotee of truth cannot stop to consider if someone will not be injured by his telling the truth, for he believes that truth can never do harm. So also about total abstinence. The abstainer will either make an exception as regards medicine, or will be prepared to risk his life in fulfilment of his full vow. What does it matter if we happen to lose our lives through a pledge of total abstinence? There can be no guarantee that our lives will be prolonged by liquor, and even if life is thus prolonged for a moment, it may be ended the very next through some other agency. On the other hand, the example of a man who gives up his life rather than his pledge, is likely to warn drunkards from liquor and thus become a great power for good in the world. Only they can hope some time to see God who have nobly determined to bear witness to the faith that is in them, even at the cost of life itself.

'Taking vows is not a sign of weakness, but of strength. To do at any cost something that one ought to do constitutes a vow. It becomes a bulwark of strength. A man who says that he will do something "as far as possible" betrays either his pride or his weakness. I have noticed in my own case, as well as in the case of others, that the limitation "as far as possible" provides a fatal loophole. To do something "as far as possible" is to succumb to the very first temptation. There is no sense in saying that we will observe truth "as far as possible". Even as no businessman will look at a note in which a man promises to pay a certain amount on a certain date "as far as possible", so will God refuse to accept a promissory note drawn by a man who will observe truth as far as possible.

'God is the very image of the vow. God would cease to be God if He swerved from His own laws even by a hair's breadth. The sun is a great keeper of observances; hence the possibility of measuring time and publishing almanacs. All business depends upon men fulfilling their promises. Are such promises less necessary in character-building or self-realization? We should therefore never doubt the necessity of vows for the purpose of self-purification and self-realization.'

Some Gandhian Reflections

ANNADA SANKAR RAY 1

The peoples of the world are witness to the achievement of Indian independence. But the manner in which India became independent has not conclusively proved the victory of non-violence. It will not impress people everywhere with the strength of non-violence, nor persuade them to believe in its efficacy. Before the fifteenth of August 1947 the atom bomb was considered to be the *ex plus ultra* of human power. Has there been any change since that date? There would have been if India's independence had been more nearly related to non-violence. The question would have arisen whether, since one country had won its independence without violence, other countries could not obtain theirs without it. Doubts about militarism would have been awakened. If militarism were once to become suspect, people everywhere would make a stand against the pouring of such vast wealth like water into preparations for war, expenditure that makes the rich meaninglessly richer and the poor more poor, the inflation that creates high prices on the one hand and scarcity on the other.

People would have said, "We refuse to fight violently. If there must be a fight, let it take place without violence. We do not want all this preparedness. We do not want all the expense it entails. We do not want inflation. We do not want a reckless economy. If the name of all these things is Capitalism it is poison to us, if their name is Socialism it is a *Dukka Jajji*!"

People would have wondered, if there is no other way, whether some arrangement is not possible in which war is not implied. If there is, may it not be worked according to the principles of non-violence? Is there no social pattern to maintain which the help of the atom bomb

1. Translated from the original Bengali by Lali Ray.

2. A fabulous sweetness which does not satisfy.

need not be taken, for which it will be sufficient to rely upon soul-force ?

People would have looked for some such pattern, and to seek is to find. That arrangement would be neither capitalism nor socialism, nor an incongruous mixture of the two, but something else. It would not be capitalism, for capitalism cannot get along without the help of militarism. A large estate cannot be managed without an army, without cannons and guns, bombs and high explosives. It would not be socialism because socialism means state-ownership, state-capitalism. The work to be done is the same although the state is the owner. The state is of course a joint estate but, like landed estates and capitalism, it depends for its maintenance upon strength of arm. Otherwise the work does not get on.

A really new arrangement would be one for whose maintenance strength of arm is not required, even though strength of arm be that of a joint estate. An arrangement that can maintain itself without the help of an army or a police force, win the whole-hearted cooperation of the majority and good-naturedly put up with the obstacles and obstructions thrown in its way by minorities, would really be a new arrangement. The first step in the direction of such an arrangement is the triumph of non-violence.

The achievement of Indian independence does not afford conclusive proof of the triumph of non-violence. But neither has non-violence been defeated. Though not entirely victorious it is unconquerable. Moreover they believe that the common people are non-violent by nature though it is possible to madden and mislead them. Violence is unnatural to them, foreign to their nature ; non-violence is their normal, natural religion. This is true just as the existence of God is true despite the fact that the pages of our history books afford no notable proof of it. The participation of the common people of India in her struggle for independence was not wholly non-violent ; still the possibility of its becoming so was always there. Those who do not believe in the maximum non-violence of the people cannot keep their belief in the undefeatability of non-violence unshaken. This is the reason that those who believe in non-violence endeavour to merge themselves with the common people. The foundations of their faith are weakened when they are cut off from the people. When non-violence does triumph indisputably the common people will be found to have displayed the maximum non-violence in the face of the maximum violent provocation.

For as it is enough to know that non-violence has not been defeated and that it still hopes to triumph. We can believe in its ultimate victory and, cherishing this hope, we can dream of a new society. The night is still deep; the dawn will be long in coming. The people have not awakened even though independence has been won. The unrest everywhere in evidence cannot be called an awakening; it will die down of its own accord. A day will come when in response to a sign from some great arbiter, the mighty sea of the people will stir. The world will then witness the triumph of non-violence.

+

As a child it seemed to me that there were two kinds of states in the world, monarchies ruled by kings and republics ruled by the people. And in my heart I desired a republic.

When I grew up I discovered that such a concept was superficial. There were two kinds of states, democracies ruled by majorities and dictatorships ruled by leaders. In my heart I desired democracy.

Growing older I made another discovery. There are two kinds of states, capitalist states ruled by the rich and socialist ones ruled by society. I wished well to socialism.

The second world war opened my eyes once again. I discovered that both capitalism and socialism derive their sustenance from war. If war were to cease altogether they both would pass out of existence. I'll tell you why.

Both capitalism and socialism endeavour to produce more and more by fewer and fewer. If two hundred thousand industrial workers can produce enough cloth to clothe four million people capitalism will design and build the necessary machines. So will socialism. The procedure in the production of other commodities is the same. By following these methods both arrive at the embarrassing position of having hundreds and thousands of unemployed. In casting about for work to give these unfortunates it is found that there is none; there are no tools, no capital. So a way is devised to make them work gratuitously. Road-building, the cutting of canals, the destruction of pestiferous weeds like the water hyacinth, the construction of buildings, the destruction of buildings, their reconstruction, the inventing of ever something new to do in order to create the illusion of progress. The state takes over the

task of clothing and feeding you. Ample provision for you is made in the national budget. But no company or factory will agree to take you on. You are surplus.

This huge surplus population is gradually absorbed by war effort. So many hundreds of thousands of rupees are shown in the budget as war expenditures. A part of this much-inflated money goes to these people. A great advantage of war is that many more people die of wounds in the attempt to destroy a Germany or Russia than die of snake-bite or sun-stroke in the attempt to destroy pettifoul hyacinth. Thus the number of the surplus falls; the state no longer need concern itself with them. On the other hand war has certain disadvantages. Not only the surplus lose their lives in war, essential people are killed as well. When high explosives drop from overhead they finish off producers of cloth, producers of food and producers of steel also. So financiers and pillars of society do not like it. But what else can be done! What inspiration is there in hyacinth to keep lakhs of surplus people working at its destruction all the time? What certainty is there that taxpayers will not make a row if provision is made for it in the budget year after year? How much more inspiring it is to cry, 'Build roads for war!' than just 'Build roads!' And how nicely quiet the taxpayers keep!

Capitalism and socialism are not the same thing. There is a great difference between the two. By comparison socialism is the better. But war is the life of both. Both throw men out of work at the very outset. Both force their unemployed to work gratuitously though of course they are fed. In the last resource they send them to war. The reason at the root of it all is their basic principle, production for many by few, the production of enough for four millions by two hundred thousand and the invention and construction of machines for that purpose. I have nothing to say against machines *per se*. But there is much to be said against the purpose for which they are designed, built and used.

Society requires to be cast into a mould designed to enable each to produce his own food and clothing and machines must be designed, built and used for that purpose. I know a single person cannot produce everything. There must be provision for the formation of societies in these matters. In addition each will take a turn at making roads, destroying hyacinth and smearing buildings. A horde of people will not require to be supported or kept engaged in unproductive labour because they are surplus. The rise of war need not be used to reduce their numbers or arrangements made to cut off their heads. The sword of India will be a state where everyone is essential and no one is surplus. That will be the way she will rule herself.

Whither Higher Education ?

N.R. MALHANI

It is now twelve years since India achieved independence. During this period we have had the first and the second Five Year Plans showing progress, more or less, in various national activities. But if there is one activity about which the national policy appears to me to be the least satisfactory it is our system of education. We are aware that the existing system is both wasteful and outworn but are not clear as to the system best suited to modern India with its growing needs. Under the stress of circumstances the old system is showing gaping cracks and new elements are creeping in to fill them up.

But it is all nearly a matter of drift wherein there is little dispute about the elements admitted but hardly any agreement about what should be eliminated. The result is a strange mix-up of old and new, without any emergence of a system of education that the country wants, keeping as present needs and past tradition in view. I think there can be no clarity about the objectives of our education until we know the kind of educated man that India wants.

Looking into the history of education one finds that different countries had different objectives of education arising out of the kind of educated man that the country desired. In England of the eighteenth and part of the nineteenth centuries the ideal of education was the Gentleman, with a love of sport and adventure, some knowledge of the classics and polished manners. The universities were expected to fashion the best gentlemen who built up the country and founded an empire. Since the second half of the present century the objective of higher education in U.S.A. and Western Europe has been to produce the sharp businessman who is alert, shrewd and hardworking and who loves to make and spend money. He is essentially an entrepreneur, an organiser of the production of wealth—the Economic Man. With recent advances in the natural sciences, the indu-

usino-merchant is being replaced by the manager-technocrat. The universities of America and Europe are now manufacturing such master-technocrats by the thousand. In Russia the objective of education is to produce technocrats who are also tough Communists. The Russian technocrat does not work for his personal profit but for the majesty and power of the state. He is dedicated to science and technology as to a religious creed. I believe that the advance of both in the U.S.S.R. will be maintained and it will be extremely difficult for any other nation ever to overtake it. This is evident from the fact that in Russia the Academy of Sciences is the most influential body after the Presidium and the Council of Ministers and consists of the elite among the scientists, who in turn are the elite of society.

What is the clear objective of higher education in modern India ? During the British Raj the primary aim of education was to produce the well-known 'Bengali Babu', or superior clerk, to help to carry on the administration at its lower levels. Since independence the aim has been somewhat glorified into the manufacture of the educated man for the higher services. At the present time the Indian universities are yet working in the moulds of the past, but at a slightly higher level to help to man the higher services. In place of the I.C.S. we have the I.A.S. dominating the educational scene but producing a second-class service man with a lower sense of responsibility and with a still lower standard of thoroughness. The Chinese mandarin with his love of scholarship and the Confucian code of conduct for the gentleman has been swept away by the rising tide of Communism in China. It will not be long before the glorified 'Bengali Babu' is also swept off the Indian scene by overwhelming outside forces that are developing in India. The days of the bureaucrat as such, even in Europe, are numbered, for the technocrat is fast advancing into the high seats hitherto occupied by him. Our universities will soon have to make up their minds as to the kind of education our best men should have. With free elementary education to come, the universities will be flooded with more numbers, who will secure degrees in higher education but will be unable to secure adequate employment in the services. Already there is a shift in the direction of our education and emphasis is being placed more on science than the humanities, we are providing for more science teaching and for the moment turning out more engineering and medical graduates. It will be apparent that the change in our education system is in consonance with trends in other parts of the world but so far this change has been slow and mostly unconscious because it arises out of an unadvised imitation of the West. The time has come when our universities must decide whether the object of higher education is to produce the gentleman-bureaucrat or the business-technocrat.

of the American type or the missionary-technologist of the Russian type.

To my mind, without denying science and fully accepting the scientific method of acquiring knowledge, the Indian universities must formulate a new objective of education which will not only be in consonance with our past traditions but also meet the pressing needs of the future. It is estimated that the U.S.A. alone produced 30,000 engineers in 1934, by the same standard the U.S.S.R. produced 70,000 engineers during the same year. At the 10-year school stage every pupil in Russia has had four years in chemistry, five years of physics and six of biology. A Russian child of ten years thus has a better scientific education than an American graduate. What the U.S.S.R. is doing today China and other Communist countries will do tomorrow, until the world will be teeming with scientists and technologists, all joining in the mad race of material production, called progress. India also needs large numbers of science graduates for helping to abolish primary poverty and bringing a decent standard of material living. We dare not neglect the achievement of material sciences abroad, considering that India is almost in the centre of an under-developed Asia, watchfully watching the 'progressive' West. But I suggest that in this we need not copy the West, or if we do we should copy with a difference. India need not become a second-class China or a third-class Russia in the pursuit of material prosperity promised by the dogmatic technocrat; nor will it accept the religion of progress through science which has inspired the West for the last 300 years.

I believe our Indian universities can teach the sciences and turn out technical graduates in a large way to meet the demand for greater production. But I do not think India will ever be able to come abreast of the Russian or even of the Chinese standard within measurable time. We will be able to make most of the machines that others make and run them almost as efficiently, but we shall never be able to lose the physical sciences or to like big machines as others do. Educated Indians have disliked manual labour and deprecated manual skills for so many centuries that they are now incapable of the arduous discipline necessary for acquiring the "feel" for the machine. Our social system has relegated manual work to the *untouch* and skilled craftsmen have no better status. Most of them in various occupations are Moslems or their good copies, the Sikhs. But we succeeded in preparing the 'clerk' at all levels, who had to be careful, exact and regular for doing his job. He was a complicated modern product, but the universities succeeded because his education fitted into the traditional system of manufacturing the 'pandit'. It will be difficult to graft the *pandit*-become-clerk on a scientist-become-technologist. It will be an arduous task for the universities to get the training of *fitnes*, *fores*

own and overcomes the prestige of an educated clerk and we know that very often this clerk goes through the skin winter of an engineer and joins it him. Our engineers have clean hands and white shirts ! Look at the prejudice against craft-oriented Basic Education and the cry against so-called child labour. The educated in India may come to realise the utter necessity of more manual labour and the value of technical skills but will hardly accept the 'dignity' of labour. His mind and his body are not made that way. This way our men will probably remain second to so many others. But this traditional disability need not stand in the way of our excellence in other lines. We have done very well in the past, not in physics but in metaphysics. We have also done well in the sciences of the mind, like logic, psychology and ethics. In fact Buddhism was based on a profound study of psychology grafted on active ethics. What *nyaya* was for a Hindu, *nyaya* was for a Buddhist. But unfortunately both Hinduism and Buddhism developed psychology and ethics for individuals and not for society. The time has come for the Indian universities to develop the faculties of the mind so as to build up the social sciences and sociological studies that have been more or less neglected in the West. The world let alone theology long ago and is not very much enamoured of metaphysics or even philosophy as such. But the world needs a basic change in the attitudes of mind, conscious and sub-conscious, so as to overtake and fit into the rapid changes in our physical environment. In this India can lead if it will, instead of being merely a camp follower in the field of the physical sciences. The social sciences, based on the study of the mind of the individual and society, leading to adequate changes in attitudes of mind have so far been overlooked in the West. It is just dawning on the best men of the West that they can be no more neglected except at the peril of the world.

According to Bertrand Russell the history of man is a history of conflicts— conflict of man with nature, of man with man, and of man with himself. Conflicts are the very web of life and well perusal. The conflicts of man with nature are nearly over and his power over nature can now be used for his good or, maybe, for his extermination. But man has yet an unending war within, which was originally a reflection of the warfare without but has now become a source of warfare within. The real war of man is with man and so within himself. With the terrifying control over nature which man today commands and with the conflict within himself unabated, the pattern of the competitive man has become technically obsolete. What is wanted is a mind in harmony with others and so with himself. The world demands a co-operative and a socially harmonious man to be able to survive in this dangerous world. Our own great men and educationists have emphasised the crises of the world as crises in the soul and

spirit of man, arising out of his excessive powers over nature and lack of control over himself. It should be the function of Indian universities to prepare the harmonious man who is reconciled within himself and so with society. There is less need of the 'good individual' than of the 'good neighbour' and the good community man. We in India have at all times produced the individual, but have hardly attempted the preparation of the good neighbour and helper of the community. This should be the attainable task of our universities.

The world today can easily be one of plenty for all or one of utter distraction. It is, however, no longer necessary to be competitive or aggressive in a world which can do away with the poor and have-nots. The habit of the acquisitive mind which thinks too much of itself is an anachronism and a peril to life. To get and to grab at the cost of others was always bad ethics but has now become bad business. To get and to give, or, better still, to share our plenty with others should be the modern ethic that should arise out of a new psychology. Vinobā has taught the poor this psychology of sharing their poverty for the good of the community. The West can easily learn the lesson of sharing the surplus riches with the world. What is required is a new attitude of mind in harmony with other minds to resolve the conflicts within. What has been taught by Gāndhī and Vinobā, the educationists of the world, should be learnt by our universities to meet the terrible impact of the new world on man. Both tradition and the crisis of the age are on their favour.

Devotional Airs Dear to Gandhi

MAHENDRA N. PANDIA

Gandhi presents one of those rare and delectable sights of a statesman who introduced the purifying, sanctifying touch of spirituality and ethics into the somewhat suffocating and, at times, dreary and dismal, not to say unwholesome, atmosphere of politics. He addressed prayer meetings as a thing of routine, and at his house a strict, rigid regimen required that Divine intercession should be sought and, when possible, obtained, irrespective of the name by which such assistance was invoked. He thus becomes a type of the wise who worked for the attainment of peaceful and active co-existence in a world of conflicting religions and set an enviable example that posterity and the world could well follow.

'All the religions of the world and their prophets speak of the supreme virtue of tolerance and harmony, and man is superior to the system he propounds', he used to say. Hence a brief study of his favourite hymns chosen from the different religions would be helpful in understanding his wide and catholic mind, which opened itself out to the winds from all quarters. The prayers he heard and recited cover many faiths and languages.

In the *Alman Bhajandevali*, there are songs from Narayn and Mira(n), Tukārām and Kabīr, Tūkārām and Nārndev; verses from the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Upasveda*; and passages from the Bible and Guru Nānak. 'When doubts assail me, haunt me, when disappointments stare me in the face, and I see not one ray of hope on the horizon, I turn to the *Bhagavad Gītā* and find a verse to comfort me, and I immediately begin to smile in the midst of overwhelming sorrow', Gandhi wrote on one occasion; on another, he admitted that the Sermon on the Mount went 'straight to my heart and delighted me'.

For him rivalry between religions did not exist and he said once to Louis Fischer, 'I am a Christian and a Hindu, and a Moslem and a Jew'. He saw in all faiths the manifestation of the same consciousness whom people call by various names in their state of semi-enlightenment. In the words of President Rajendra Prasad, 'all his acts took on a semi-religious colour—his self-purificatory fasts, his ascetical spinning, his Inner Voice, his day of silence, his insistence on truth and non-violence, his prayer meetings'. His songs extolled obedience to the Merciful spirit, there is in them a prayer for light and Truth and Guidance, also the conviction that Truth alone would prevail; and the realisation that anger leads to confusion and that in turn to loss of memory, till ultimately intelligence withers and with it man perishes. There are lines from Tulsi and Śrīdāśa stressing that God is the strength of the weak and the oppressed. There are pleas for the removal of pride, passion and egoism.

*Hiraprayasa pātrava satyaṁ apātrava mādham,
Tat tava pātra apātrava satya-dharmatya dharmya.*

These lines from the *Āra Upaniṣad* stress the need for truth in life.

*Satyam eva jayate na anyatam
Satyena paṇḍitā vitarā devayājinaḥ,
Yena dharmaṁ prajāḥ le dhatāntaḥ,
Yena tat satyaṁ paramam aśāntam.*

Here again is emphasized his unswerving belief that 'Truth alone will win in the end'.

The verses from the *Gītā* stress again not the semantic point of view but the ethical and moral, and hence the necessary attitude to life. Gāndhī had a penchant for those lines that described the *sthita-prajña*—one who remained rock-like in the midst of the storms of the world. The state of bliss is to be reached by the renunciation of passions, withdrawal of the senses and self-control.

A verse from the *Dhātalela-pañjarikā* lays emphasis on the emptiness of wealth and of material possessions and of their want of utility.

The Hindi *Bhājans* from Śrīdāśa, Kābir, Tulsi, Nānak, all speak of ethical and spiritual values. Utter dedication to and absolute confidence in God are the keywords.

*Raghav-va tunda meri lāḥ,
Sakī sakī meri(n) savaṁ tūhai tum hōḥe garibhāḥ/
Paṭī-udhāraṁ bhūḥ nāḥa saravama meri andī.*

—sings Tulsi and puts his hand in the hand of Raghavīr Rāma

Sakī meri(n) se sirbāḥ ke bāḥ Rām.

of all places and times and a piece of wisdom worthy of the highest praise. It was Gandhi's aim to live up to this ideal and we, too, should ever strive to reach out to this perfection of man. Shakespeare's Hamlet speaks of 'What a piece of work is a man, how noble in reason . . .'. But Narayn Mehta speaks of man's higher spiritual possibilities—and Gandhi desired this to be the common aim and the common striving. Narayn would have us all remember God and forsake possessiveness if we are to assess ourselves truly and effectively.

Thus ran the hymns that Gandhi loved to hear and recite, hymns that chastened and subdued the run-away mind, deluded by the will-o'-the-wisp of material prosperity and the ignoble strife of the madding crowd. *My prayer is heard who asks for himself, nothing, for others, all that is good and pure*, who confesses without concealment, who rises a better man, humble, devout, strong in faith; who repents his wrongs and resolves to go higher with calm of mind, all passions spent, a dedicated spirit, selfless and true, believing that more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.

Thus the hymns dear to Gandhi preached no doctrine or narrow religion, advocated no bigotry, countenanced no hatred or ill-will. They spoke of self-purification and self-confession, of reformation and of love supreme—*over which comes*—and thus paved the way for a world wherein all could live in a friendly brotherhood of men under the wide and benign fatherhood of God. In these lines, anthologised from the scriptures of many lands and peoples, there is nothing that even the most devout or the least enlightened would find objectionable, that time would disapprove, or that our widening, extending horizons of knowledge would render stale, fat or out of date. Herein lie the proven wisdom and experience of countless men and of many centuries. Human lie the needs of the new world order we are all so manfully striving to build, of the better scheme of things we are aiming at. Our universe, so the poets would have us believe, was built to the notes of music, why then should not our brave new world of the morrow be rebuilt to the bit of so much music combined with so much wisdom?

Gandhi thus offers, even posthumously, a solution to a tired and weary, confused and impoverished world, a solution quite in keeping with the culture of the Indian nation, its history and its people, and which humanity can now ignore only at its peril. He has proved the possibility of the religious co-existence that is so necessary today, so that men might break the walls his hands have constructed in their folly and unwisdom and which separate what they should unity and protect and cherish.

Letters to the Editor

The Editor, *Gandhi Marg*.

Sir,

I read Ethel Mannin's letter on Dr Schweitzer and was much pained. I am one of the numerous admirers who were struck with grief when Reginald Reynolds died prematurely. I am sure if he were alive he would have disapproved of what his dear wife has written and perhaps would have burst into verse over it. I was an admiring reader of his rhymes in *New Statesman* every week, in which he obligated people with love and great ability.

The Nobel Prize authorities did well in honouring Dr Schweitzer. That they did not honour Gandhi need not irritate anyone, for the loss is only theirs. And I for one would not like Gandhi or Chait to compete for any such awards.

C Rajagopālācārī.

60, Baduliah Road,
Tytgarlyanagar,
Madras 17

The Editor, *Gandhi Marg*.

Sir,

I went through with pleasure the letter by Ethel Mannin on 'Dr Schweitzer and Respect for Life' published in your issue of January 1959. The extract from *Young India* which you have published at the end of her letter is sufficient reply to her. In my article I never mentioned that Dr Schweitzer is 'a pacifist', I have not also considered his political views, whether his attitude to the Africans is 'strictly paternal' or whether he is a 'benevolent imperialist'. I was concerned only with his general attitude towards respect for life as a whole. The assessment of the two personalities—the Mahatma as a great man, and Dr Schweitzer as a brilliant man—is a matter of personal opinion. Regarding the non-award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Gandhi, I should like to draw the attention of Ethel Mannin to my article published in the January 1957 issue of *Gandhi Marg* in which I had

quoted a paragraph from a publication of the Nobel Foundation, *Nobel, the Man and His Times*. That I think is sufficient expression of regret for the omission on the part of the authorities of the Foundation.

K. P. Sankara Menon.

Sanjar Villa,
Pirer, Kerala.

The Editor, *Gandhi Marg*.

Sir,

Ethel Mannin begins her important contribution to this question¹ by describing my differences with Professor Zacher as a 'Marxist attack'. The worldly wise, familiar with the rudeness of Winkledon and Winkledon, will recognise certain implications in this apparent label; but I prefer, since label-sticking is an adolescent immaturity one cannot expect in anyone maturely concerned with spiritual values, to regard it as an undesired compliment to an old friend. Undesired because Marxists are serious students who move in communities of Marxist scholarship and practice which receive me only as an occasional guest.

My appreciation of Miss Mannin's generosity remains undisturbed by the word I have italicised in the following passage: 'Hitler's Germany had reached a very advanced stage of social development

but I doubt whether even Mr Dover would consider the Nazis and their supporters to have been what is generally understood by civilised people. Yet if one is to equate civilisation with material progress, as Mr Dover evidently does, Nazi Germany was highly civilised.'

Overlooking its peculiar 'even', so obviously introduced for the entertainment of my friends by an imp in the composer's room or Miss Mannin's typewriter, puzzles the passage somewhat, but leaves objections to its analogic structure. Is not 'Hitler's Germany' a thought-obscuring phrase for a capitalist situation in which Germany's Hitler represented the rather common German to a quite uncommon degree? Did that Germany reach 'a very advanced stage of social development', or had it already reached, when Hitler was brought to power, a high level of technological skill in circumstances that urged expansion and hostility to communism at the cost of social development? Is there any basis for the assumption, so confidently attributed to me, that Nazi Germany was 'highly civilised' because it had made some kinds of 'material progress'? Surely, it has long been clear that Nazi atrocities, like those of all aggressive nations, were largely motivated by lack of balanced material progress.

Turning to the other complexities of Miss Mannin's letter, I cannot deal with those in which she

1. See *Gandhi Marg*, October 1958.

has involved me directly without seeming ungrateful to a writer whose work and example taught me many early lessons in materialism—I remain stubbornly materialistic, while she has found enlightenment, but I share her concern for 'the gem-like flame' (what an interesting metaphor!) 'of the human spirit'. Moreover, I do not possess a 'telly', a radio, a refrigerator or a washing machine, though I recognize the cultural potentialities of these instruments. I have not felt the need, since I belong with millions who walk barefoot, of 'more than one pair of shoes'; as a biologist, reared in the Indian tradition of Albert Howard, Gilbert Fowler and Robert McCaenon, I have probably been more intimately concerned with the preservation of natural fertility than Miss Mannin, and as a life-long, if sometimes lazy and cowardly, participant in the struggle against all forms of fascism it was natural for me to move actively, and from its beginning, into the campaign against the menace of nuclear power.

At the same time I have developed, inevitably, sufficient respect for all living things to be distressed by Miss Mannin's approving reference to Hendrik Van Loon's sick joke at some men and all baboons. Professor Zuckerk, I am sure, will not relish being identified with this more than half-forgotten purveyor of tabloid knowledge.

I am no less distressed by Miss

Mannin's quotation from that other, and more fulsome, relic of the American 'twenties, Dhan Gopal Mukerji. For I find no understanding of the dynamics of Gandhian teaching, and a positive insult to India, in the Mukerji-Mannin invitation to 'Behold, she (India) has given birth to Gandhi! Having lit that candle at the altar of humanity she can well afford to be *slow*' (my italics) 'another thousand years'.

Nor is it a tribute to Indians to be told that India 'is vastly more civilized than America', because India produced the Upanishads and the Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi'. It is wholly irrelevant, and really rather comic, to compare a country, already rich in ancient culture during the period of the Upanishads and Gautama Buddha, with a nation built by hard-working immigrants, guinea, slave labour and much technological 'know-how' in little more than three centuries.

And it is really rather sad that Mahatma Gandhi should be included among the proofs of India's spiritual superiority. For India's pride in Gandhi lies in the fact that he is more than Indian. He is a world figure shaped by world situations, professionally educated in England, stocked to struggle in the harshness of South Africa, and greatly influenced by the world religions and naturalistic teachings of his day. No reasonable American would suggest that America is 'vastly more civilized' than India

because Thoreau was one of Gandhi's acknowledged masters; and no reasonable Indian can afford the temptation, placed in our way by Miss Mannan, to put on airs because Gandhi was born at Porbandar.

Finally, I regret that Miss Mannan, having announced imperiously that we should 'define our terms', leads us through a labyrinth of words without defining them. What is civilisation? Miss Mannan does not tell us, though she gives the impression of possessing secret knowledge which enables her to say that the definition of civilisation in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* is 'quite startlingly inadequate'. The actual definition, which she misquotes, is a 'stage, especially advanced stage, in social development'.

Can Miss Mannan improve this definition? It would be a service if she can. Meanwhile, since I am unable to improve it myself, I accept it as adequate, within the intention to be concise, and in accordance with history. For civilisation began when groups of men turned from gathering and hunting their food to cultivating it—and advanced with every subsequent gain in control over nature.

In other words, the growth of civilisation, and with it of culture and aesthetic responses and values, has always depended closely on material progress. Indeed, if the examples cited by Miss Mannan as

illustrating the 'disjunction between material and spiritual' were expanded into a catalogue, every item in it would emphasise the unity of material and spiritual.

Materialistic philosophy, as I know it, is based on this understanding. It promotes a unitary approach, not a dichotomous one, and it is a sheer necessity of the truth to maintain that those who have it are got at least as concerned about egotisms, freedoms, distinctions, wicked gadgetry and all the rest of it as Professor Zachar and Miss Mannan, who have somehow failed to discuss the role of the profit motive in stimulating what Yeblen called 'compulsory consumption'.

Gandhi, too, had a unitary materialistic approach, into which he fitted qualifications, reservations and opinions on industrialisation that were opposed by some of his closest colleagues. In fact, the Indian struggle was able to survive its tremendous internal conflicts because he knew, as every Swami did, that freedom from 'the snail of living in a puppet's world', as Tagore had put it, was also freedom to nourish material progress; and so to release Indian culture—the 'Indian soul' in the language of complicated devotees of Gandhian simplicity—from the weeds that prevented its flowering.

Unitary thinking, Miss Mannan's letter forces me to add, breeds com-

passion and humility—and in Gandhi these qualities flowed over to a truly saintly extent. The communist way was not his, but Miss Marritt's assertion, as confident and rhetorically asserted as her account of the horrors of Western living, that 'Marxism is a negation of civilisation' would have grieved him greatly. He would have thought it contrary to respect for the 'human spirit' and the ideal of brotherhood, and he would have asked himself if a thousand million or so people in the communist countries were so lacking in vision and courage that they allowed themselves to be 'bound and delivered' by a few sinister Marxists into 'the perilous darkness of illusion'. He might not have thought about the consequences of attracting rather commonly 'exceptional people' as disciples but I do.

Cedric Dover.

Brentford, Middlesex

The Editor, *Gandhi Marg*.

Sir,

As I am writing a book on Gandhi's humour, I shall be very thankful if any of your readers will be kind enough to write to me of any instances of Gandhi's humour or jokes with them (or with any others they know of) for inclusion in the volume. I wish to show Gandhi as a warm-hearted person who could share and enjoy a joke and with whom a crack and a joke were usual and not exceptional. I have collected as many instances of Gandhi's humour as can be found in Gandhi literature and it is the unrecorded personal instances readers know of that I am looking for.

S. Datta Raja Singam

Kumtlan, Malaya

Book Reviews

M. B. Byles. *Footprints of Gautama the Buddha*. London Rider 16s.

Though everyone in India, even quite young children, knows something about the Buddha, and scholars know a great deal, I have found very few in the ranks of the fairly well educated who know much beyond the story of his early life and a few famous sayings from his teaching. Such books as there are tend to be either meant for school children or far too scholarly for the taste of the average man and woman. I have rarely found one that strikes the happy medium between these extremes as does this one.

Footprints is not concerned with the Buddha's early life but begins with the Enlightenment and goes the story of the long years of the Buddha's ministry as reported by one of the earliest disciples. Though it reads like a novel, at the end of every chapter is a list of the passages from the sacred scriptures from which the material has been drawn.

I know no book on the Buddha that gives so vivid a picture of life in India in the fifth century B. C., and brings out so clearly the charm and dynamic quality and sense of

humour of that supremely great personality of ancient India. Anyone claiming or aspiring to be a disciple of the supremely great personality of modern India (as, presumably, all readers of *Gandhi Mārg* are) will find very great stimulus and interest in this book, for though it might seem at first sight that the two great teachers had different aims and methods, a closer scrutiny will reveal much common ground. Both the Buddha and the Mahātmā were concerned with the welfare (in the fullest sense of that word) of their followers, especially 'the poorest, the lowliest and the lost'. Both believed implicitly in the power of non-violence. Both drew their inspiration and strength from the inner life of the spirit. Both had the power to win the love and allegiance of all sorts and kinds of people from the highest to the lowest and to draw out the best that lies hidden in human nature. Both believed in encouraging the higher life of women as well as men.

The author believes that fellowship between people belonging to different religions is both possible and desirable, as the Mahātmā also believed when he made 'respect for and knowledge of religions other than one's own' one of the foundation-stones of the Basic Education which he pioneered. Anyone wishing to build on that stone by widening his knowledge of Buddhism could hardly do better than read this book.

Margaret Burr

GANDHIAN LITERATURE

BY MAHATMA GANDHI

Autobiography (Cardboard-bound)	1.00
" (Paper-bound)	2.00
" (Abridged)	1.00
" (School)	1.50
Asiatic Observations in Asiatic	1.00
Bapu's Letters to Ashwin Bhattar	1.50
Bapu's Letters to Mera	4.00
Basic Education	1.00
Communal Unity	4.00
Christmas Messages	3.00
Constructive Programme	0.15
Dolls Diary	1.00
East & West Reform	1.00
Drink, Drugs and Gambling	2.00
Economics & Industrial Life & Relations—1 Vol.	4.00
Food Storage and Agriculture	1.50
From Torvalds Maadar	0.37
Gandhi Anthology 1 & II	1.00
Gandhi's correspondence with Government (1942-44)	1.00
Hard Swara	0.50
Hindi and English in the South	0.30
Hindu Dharma	4.00
How to Serve the Cow	1.25
Key to Health	0.30
Khadi	1.00
Letters to Sarder Vallabhbhai	1.50
My Religion	2.00
Medium of Instruction	0.15
Non-violence in Peace and War	
Vol. I & II	12.00
Ramdas	4.45
Rebuilding Our Villages	1.50
Removal of Untouchability	1.50
Satyagraha	4.00
Satyagraha in South Africa	4.00
Selections from Gandhi	2.00
Self-Breast vs. Self-Indulgence	2.00
Thoughts on National Language	2.00
Towards New Education	1.00
Towards Non-violent Socialism	1.00
Truth is God	1.00
Women & Social Injustice	2.00
Obituary My Political Diary	1.00
My Dear Child	1.50
To The Students	1.00
To Students	2.00
Unto This Last	0.37

LATEST PUBLICATIONS

Ball Ganga-dhar Triak	1.00
A Philosophy of India	
Economic Development	2.50
A Shantiniketan Pilgrimage	0.40
Women	1.00
Wool Wrought by English Medium	0.35
Mind of Mahatma Gandhi	4.00
Hommage to the Departed	1.50
Index of My Dreams	1.50
Nikhar Mah	1.00
Panchayat Raj	0.30
Risk Control—The Right Way and the Wrong Way	0.30
The Long Road	2.00

LATEST REPRINTS

Cost Per Cent Swadeshi	1.50
Swadeshi (Welfare of all)	2.00
Swadeshi	0.40
Gandhi's Ethics	0.75
Satyagraha in Champaran	2.25
The Story of Burish	3.00
Resister Yogi	0.47
A Vision of Future India	0.75
Why Prohibition	0.50
An Affair with Gandhi	0.75

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The Diary of Mahadevi Doss	3.00
Gita According to Gandhi (Cardboard-bound)	4.00
Gita According to Gandhi (Paper-bound)	3.00
A Compass for Civilization	1.00
Which Way? Lin. Hope ?	2.00
Siraj Glimpses of Bapu	1.00
Gandhi & Mera	1.00
J.C. Kamdar	1.50
Prayers & Concepts of Jesus	1.50
Pilgrimage for Peace	3.00
Sarder Vallabhbhai Vol. I	8.00
II	3.00
Our Language Problem	2.50
Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi	4.00
At the Feet of Bapu	4.00
My Childhood with Gandhiji	2.50

Passage no. 200A.

Full Catalogue of Publications will be sent on demand

BY PFARLAL.

MAHATMA GANDHI—THE LAST PHASE VOL. I & II

(Autobiography covering last phase of Gandhi's life)

Price each Vol. Rs. 30/-, Passage Vol. I Rs. 1/- Vol. II Rs. 1/50

NAVAJIVAN TRUST

Crosslight Garden, New Delhi 130 Prison Street, Bombay-7, Khadi Gramodyog Bhawan, Dadabhai Naoroji Road, Ambari, Ahmednagar Park, Lucknow, Govind Mitra Road, Patna-4, Trilokyan Road, Azim-41, Eden Hospital Road, Calcutta 12, 32/1/11, Meera Road, Madras-6, Chaudh Bania, Jaipur.
P. O. NAVAJIVAN AHMEDABAD-14.

Some Articles Of Interest From Back Numbers Of Gandhi Marg

January 1937

Horace Alexander
Margaret Barr
Kakasaheb Kalelkar

Gandhi and Reverence for All Faiths
Gandhi's Way in Religious Education
Gandhi and the Language Question

April 1937

R.C. Zachar
Bharatan Kumarappa
Wilfred Wellock

Religions and the Challenge of Materialism
The Roots of Gandhi's Religion
Why Village Republics?

July 1937

John S. Hoyland
W.E.B. Du Bois
Loet Birdwood

Mahatma Gandhi and the War on War
Gandhi and the American Negroes
Gandhi and Communism—a Speculation

October 1937

R. R. Dinkar
S.G. Bhavs
P.T. Raju

Gandhian Non-violence : a Landmark
Satyagraha and Democracy
The Four Basic Principles of Gandhi's Philosophy

January 1938

S. Radhakrishnan
U.N. Dichter
Gyan Chand

A Divided Inheritance
Bhutan and the Socialist Pattern of Society
Bhutan as a Social Revolution

April 1938

V.M. Bedekar
Homer A. Jack
Richard B. Gregg

Ahimsa in the Mahabharata—and Gandhi
Gandhi and the Communists
A President's Five-Year Plan

July 1938

B. Natanson
J. Vijayaranga
R.G. Gokhale

Gandhi and Thomas
Gandhi—a Man Alone
Gandhism and Socialism

October 1938

Vinoba Bhave
Reginald Reynolds
Esmé Wynne-Tyson

The Steadfast Wisdom
Jack Hoyland—an English follower of Gandhi
The True Significance of Gandhi

January 1939

George Hendrick
Harold Wofford
P. C. Gupta

Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King
Non-violence and the Law
Impact of Gandhi on Hindi Literature

Copies of some of these numbers still available

GANDHI MARG

Reginald New Delhi-1

Gandhi Marg

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF GANDHIAN THOUGHT

*There is no such thing as Gandhism
and I do not want to leave any seat after me.*

VOLUME THREE NUMBER THREE JULY 1959

GANDHI SMARAK NIDHI

Former Chairmen

Dr. Rajendra Prasad
Shri G.V. Mavalankar
Shri B.G. Kher

Present Board of Trustees

Chairman Shri R. R. Diwaker
Vice-Chairman Smt. Sucheta Kripalani

Members

Sri. Jawaharlal Nehru	Dr. Gopichand Bhargava
Sri. C. Rajagopalachari	Smt. Yashodhara Dasappa
Sri. G. Balisbhai Pant	Smt. A. Aryanayakum
Sri. Jagdish Ram	Dr. Prafulla Chandra Ghosh
Rajkumari Arun Kaur	Dr. Zakir Husain
Acharya J.B. Kripalani	Sri. U. N. Dhebar
Sri. Jhanganji R. D. Tata	Sri. Yashwanth L. Mehta
Sri. Kasturba Lalbhai	Sri. Motaraj Desai
Lala Shri Ram	Sri. Kamal Nayak Bajaj
Mr. A. P. Benthall	Smt. Laxmi Behn Gandhi

Executive Committee

Chairman Shri R. R. Diwaker
Vice-Chairman Smt. Sucheta Kripalani

Members

Sri. Jawaharlal Nehru	Rajkumari Arun Kaur
Lala Shri Ram	Smt. Yashodhara Dasappa
Acharya J. B. Kripalani	Sri. U.N. Dhebar
Laxmi Behn Gandhi	Shri Motaraj Desai

Secretary Shri G. Ramachandran

Holding Trustees

Sri. G.D. Birla, Chairman
Sri. Kasturba Lalbhai Vice-Chairman
Sri. J.R.D. Tata
Lala Shri Ram
Smt. Sucheta Kripalani
Sri. Motaraj Desai

Central Office : near, Rajghat, New Delhi.

Gandhi Marg

Editor

G. RAMACHANDRAN

VOLUME THREE

NUMBER THREE

JULY 1999

GANDHI SMARAK NIDHI

RANGHAT NEW DELHI

EDITORIAL BOARD

R. R. DIWAKAR

I. B. KRIPALANI

JAIRAMDAS DOULATRAM

SHRIMAN NARAYAN

SADIQ ALI

G. RAMACHANDRAN

PUBLISHER

T. K. MAHADEVAN

Rs 1.00 a year in South Asia; 12s. or \$2.00 elsewhere; postage.

Rs 1.30 (12s. or 17s.) the copy. Payment in advance

*Published by T.K. Mahadevan for the Gandhi Research Nidhi, Rajghat, New Delhi, and
printed by him at the Narayana Press Private Limited (Successors of Arjun Press) Delhi.*

Contents

	Editorial Notes 153
Vinoba Bhave	The Steadfast Wisdom 160
George Hendrick	Influence of Thoreau and Emerson on Gandhi's <i>Satyagraha</i> 165
Trilok Kumar Chaudhuri	Gandhi and the Revolutionary Socialist Party 179
James E. Sefton	Reflections of a Pacifist after Eighteen Months in India 185
	Nehru Remembers Gandhi 192
	Some Letters from Gandhi to Tagore : (1932-1933) 197
Reginald Reynolds	The Map of Mrs. Brown 204
M. Yashwantharya	Gandhi in Kannada Literature 208
William Robert Miller	Brahmacarya and Human Destiny 215
	Book Reviews 220
G. Ramachandran	The Gandhi Smarak Nidhi. Its Work and Plans 230

Contributors to this Number

Yashabhai Bhavet : This is the fourth chapter of his forthcoming book on the GMS concept of *atitapasya*. The first three chapters appeared in *Gandhi Mārg*, October 1958 and January and April 1959.

James E. Bristol : A prominent American pacifist, he recently returned to the United States after a successful term of service as India as Director of the Quaker Centre in Delhi. This is his first contribution to *Gandhi Mārg*.

Tudih Karmar Chaudhary : Journalist, author and political worker, he has been a member of the Indian parliament from its inception. Since May 1957 he is the General Secretary of the Revolutionary Socialist Party. His article is the second in our series of articles on the general theme of 'Gandhi and the Political Parties of India'.

George Hendrick : Editor of a new facsimile edition of the '1883 *Stagnant Ghat*', the first English translation of the work by Charles Williams of the East India Company, Dr Hendrick teaches English at the University of Colorado and is a frequent contributor to *Gandhi Mārg*. One of his main interests is

research on the literary influences of Gandhi.

William Robert Miller : He is associated with The Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York, and wrote the first of his contributions to *Gandhi Mārg* after reading Bama Wyano-Tyson's article entitled 'The True Significance of Gandhi' in our October 1958 issue.

Reginald Reynolds sent us the present essay shortly before his death in December 1958. It was the last we received from him, and so far as *Gandhi Mārg* is concerned it is virtually his own song. In a letter enclosing the essay he wrote 'I'm afraid I forgot and wrote it with an English paper and English readers in mind. But the problem is, I think, universal - so the reference to my English model and to British institutions is in fact only a local application of something which is unfortunately as true in other parts of the world.'

M. Yamanicharya : Retired professor of philosophy of the University of Mysore and now Chief Editor of the *Works of Gandhi* in Kanara. He has written before in *Gandhi Mārg*.

Editorial Notes

The Gandhi Peace Foundation

In the April issue of *Gandhi Mārg* it had been promised that the full text of the Constitution of the Gandhi Peace Foundation in its final form would be published in this number. We are happy to be able to do this now. It will be seen that the Constitution is simple, elastic and self-evolving.

There will be little delay now in commencing the work of the Gandhi Peace Foundation after the first meeting of its Governing Body, which will be held any time this July.

All those interested in this major project launched by the Gandhi National Memorial Fund are currently requested to study the Constitution of the Foundation, on which we shall be grateful to receive constructive suggestions.

THE CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE 1

Preamble and Objective

In his unique and inspiring leadership of the struggle for freedom in India, Mahātmā Gandhi showed the way for a new life based on the values of *satya* (truth) and *ahimsā* (non-violence), with the inevitable corollary that good ends can be achieved only through good means, both in individual and group life. He applied these methods to the national struggle involving millions of people and thereby helped them to achieve freedom without hatred or armed conflict. The peaceful struggle

ended in a settlement which achieved the objective aimed at and yet left no trace of bitterness behind.

Although Gandhi applied these methods in India, he held that they were applicable everywhere for the solution of any kind of conflict, social, national or international. Though Gandhi's teaching and example have so far touched the mind and life of only a few, there is the faith that in course of time they will affect the thoughts and actions of millions throughout the world and usher in a new way of life for mankind.

The Gandhi Peace Foundation is being formed for the furtherance of this objective and to promote the acceptance by all peoples of the principles of truth and non-violence in the conduct of social, national and international affairs.

ARTICLE 2

Functions

In order to achieve this objective, the functions of the Foundation will be :

- (i) to establish an international centre of study and research in the principles of non-violence as evident from the study of the history and philosophy of India and of the world ;
- (ii) to investigate and study in cooperation with other agencies, where necessary, methods for the application of non-violence in social, national, racial and international affairs ;
- (iii) to provide information, counsel and assistance in this field to teaching institutions in the form of research fellowships, travel grants, library books and equipment and act as a co-ordinating authority ;
- (iv) to assist in developing an informed public opinion on the principles and techniques of non-violence among all peoples ; and
- (v) generally to take all necessary action to attain the objective of the Foundation.

ARTICLE 3

Name and Definition

The Foundation shall be called the Gandhi Peace Foundation. It

shall be a national and an international association formed in India and with headquarters in India.

ARTICLE 4

Location

The headquarters of the Foundation shall be located in the premises of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi (Gandhi National Memorial Fund) near Rajghat, New Delhi.

The Foundation may, if and when necessary, establish other centres of work in India and elsewhere.

ARTICLE 5

Membership

There shall be four categories of members who will constitute the Foundation : Foundation Members ; Fellows of the Foundation ; Associate Members ; and Life Members.

(i) *Foundation Members* : All persons invited by the Chairman of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi to become Foundation Members and who accept the invitation will be the Foundation Members. The number of such members shall not exceed 21.

(ii) *Fellows of the Foundation* . Persons from India and abroad who undertake systematic study and research under the auspices of or in close association with the Foundation will be eligible for being enrolled as Fellows of the Foundation by the Governing Body.

(iii) *Associate Members* : Persons who associate themselves closely and actively with the work of the Foundation in India or abroad will be eligible for being enrolled as Associate Members by the Governing Body. Such association may be either in academic study and research or in experiments with truth and non-violence or in appropriate constructive work.

(iv) *Life Members* . Persons who pledge themselves to dedicated and life-long service under the Foundation with abiding faith in its objectives mentioned in Article 1 will be eligible for Life Membership. (The Governing Body will, in due course, promote a scheme of Life Membership and enrol Life Members from among those who are eligible and provide them with opportunities to take increasing responsibility in the work of the Foundation.)

ARTICLE 6

Governing Body

The Foundation Members shall constitute the Governing Body of the Foundation. Representation for Fellows and Life Members in the Governing Body may, however, be provided for when a sufficient number of these categories of members has been enrolled and under such rules to be made in this regard by the Governing Body.

The Governing Body shall decide all matters of policy and administration.

The Chairman and the Secretary of the *Gandhi Smarak Nidhi* shall be ex-officio members of the Governing Body.

The Governing Body shall elect its Chairman and Secretary from among its members.

The Governing Body shall also lay down the procedure and make rules for the conduct of its own business and that of the Executive Committee referred to in Article 7.

ARTICLE 7

Executive Committee

An Executive Committee consisting of not more than seven Foundation Members shall be appointed by the Governing Body for carrying on the day-to-day work of the Foundation.

The Chairman and the Secretary of the Governing Body shall be the Chairman and the Secretary respectively of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE 8

Council for Study and Research

The Governing Body will set up a 'Council for Study and Research' consisting of eminent thinkers and scholars for guiding the Fellows of the Foundation as also the Associate Members.

Representation for Associate Members in the 'Council for Study and Research' may be provided for when a sufficient number of these members has been enrolled and under such rules to be made in this regard by the Governing Body.

ARTICLE 9

Amendment of the Constitution

The Governing Body shall have the right to make such changes in the Constitution as are not inconsistent with Articles 1 and 2, by a two-thirds majority of the total number of members.

Explanatory Note

A revolution is primarily and fundamentally a change in the base values of life. On the basis of the new values is built a new culture, a new way of life and a new phase of human civilization. A revolution may be initiated by a great personality or arise from a sudden outburst of the repressed forces of progress or its course may be comparatively gradual, even when its nature is radical, as in the case of the Industrial Revolution. It may emerge from religious, political, economic or social causes. Whatever be the originating impulse, if it succeeds, it tends to affect the whole of life, individual and collective.

It must not however be supposed that the ideas that give birth to a revolution spring to life all of a sudden. When analysed, the causes are found to have been at work prior to the efforts of the inspiring genius or the sudden outburst. Further, no revolution is complete with the passing away of the person who gave it the first impulse or the outburst that heralded it. That is only the beginning. The work of the revolution is continued, extended and consolidated by generations of people who have faith in the new values and in the new way of life. But every revolution has its own rhythm and when fairly complete creates its own system of social arrangements.

Those responsible for conceiving the idea of the Gandhi Peace Foundation believe that Gandhi initiated a revolution in the life of humanity based on truth, non-violence and a strict regard for the means used to achieve worthwhile ends.

Gandhi's ideas would not be exhausted or even fully explained by merely an analysis and evaluation of the possibilities of non-violence in national and international political life. The revolution that he initiated goes much further and deeper and manifests itself in every important aspect of life creating a new individual in a new society. It has, therefore, like other revolutions, as already stated, its own rhythm and concept of a new society.

Gandhi, not being a philosopher in the ordinary sense of the term or a theoretician, did not care to systematise his thought; much less did he formulate a rigid social system. He was first and foremost a man of action. Explanation came afterwards and it then brought out the basic ideas and principles underlying action. Yet there can be little doubt that he brought his practical revolutionary ideas to bear upon every sphere of life and there is an underlying unity binding them. It may truly be said of him that he strove to purify the life of India from its latencies to its soul. Though his field of activity after the germinal years in South Africa was confined to India, his ideas and his methods of action have a universal application.

It should be the task of the Gandhi Peace Foundation to systematise these ideas and methods of work and unfold their rhythm by a careful study of Gandhi's life, and the large volume of writings that he produced and the speeches he delivered in English, Hindi and Gujarati. It should also be its effort to understand the significance of the changing technique he employed to bring about desirable ends, in consonance with his basic moral principles. Further, a comprehensive study of Gandhi's life and thought must include an examination of the practical schemes of constructive work that were organised and promoted by him and also similar schemes devised after him but which derive their light and inspiration from his life and teachings. There is also the important task of studying the historical background in India and elsewhere of his thought and pattern of action.

Since a revolution is invariably preceded by a general ferment in society, the student must also study the air in Indian society during the nineteenth century, before Gandhi appeared on the field of Indian public life. This upsurge of the Indian spirit was part of the Indian renaissance and even while Gandhi represented its climax he was at the same time the initiator of a new epoch in our history.

The Foundation should study the working of the institutions engaged in constructive work on the lines indicated by Gandhi. This will bring a deeper insight into Gandhi's ideas and actions and the possibility of their practical application to the solution of the problems facing the confused world of today, where old values and standards are crumbling, creating a moral vacuum, which is largely filled by the pursuit of success and power and the satisfaction of the senses.

When it is said that Gandhi's ideas need to be elucidated and systematised, it is not meant that they should be put into a rigid or inflexible system. In fact they would not lend themselves to such

menters. Nor is there any question of uncritical acceptance of everything. There should be free scope for the expression of differences of opinion, arising from sincere conviction, moral or intellectual.

On Dr Schweitzer

Ethel Mannin's letter to the Editor containing certain remarks on Dr Albert Schweitzer in our January issue promptly brought forth a very delectable and brief rejoinder from one of India's wisest and most revered leaders, Śat C. Rāṅgopillāhāri. What he wrote might well represent the opinion of innumerable people throughout India and the world. Later we have received more letters questioning the appropriateness of Ethel Mannin's remarks. Dr Schweitzer is one of the radiant figures in the world today and we do not wish to prolong this unnecessary controversy over his greatness which will stand in spite of whatever might be true in the remarks of Ethel Mannin. This controversy should therefore be deemed to be closed in our pages.

A CORRECTION

In 'Some Gandhian Reflections' by Anand Śankar Ray (*Gandhi Māg.* April 1959) the words 'four million people' (page 134) and 'four millions' (page 135) should of course read 'four hundred million people' and 'four hundred millions' respectively. The error is regretted.

The Steadfast Wisdom

VINDRA BHAVE¹

The features which characterize the Steadfast Wisdom have been fully set forth in the first four verses.² Now we must turn our attention to the science and epistemology of sense suppression. The science was dealt with in the first three verses. The methods given are the comparatively easy ones. First we have been advised to forgo desire; secondly, not to permit the consequences of desire, that is, not to allow desire to grow into hunger, fear and anger; and thirdly, in the event of consequences appearing in spite of our efforts, to keep them under control and to prevent them from affecting the mind. Fourthly we are advised to withdraw our senses, not to allow them to wander about. The four categories into which these methods have been classified indicate how spiritual discipline is to be begun. The fourth method, the withdrawal of the senses, is described as the simplest. The Steadfast Wisdom cannot be attained before the last and highest step is attained is reached. No one should make the mistake of supposing that it can. For sense control in itself, maintained through restraint and suppression, is not enough to win the Wisdom. Not even to the extent of the control? No, for this control does not suffice to give complete mastery of the senses. It does, however, make it possible for us to root desire completely out of our inner selves. For the strength that comes with the realization that our senses will behave as we wish them to behave enables us to go further and eliminate desire altogether. This is necessary. The senses are not, in my opinion, completely mastered until this has been accomplished. To me sense control is as subtle as that. The idea is formulated in one verse. It is the beginning of the science of sense suppression.

Vicāraḥ samantam ārabhito'ya dehīnā,

Bhūtarjunaś caid'gyānaḥ parāḥ dhyātāḥ svataḥ.

1. Translated from the original Hindi by Lili Sāp.

2. See *Gāndhī Mātā*, January and April 1926.

'The objects of sense turn away from the embodied soul who abstains from feeding on them but the taste for them remains. Even the taste turns away when the Supreme is seen.'

The desire to enjoy objects of sense remains after these objects themselves have departed. They depart from one who abstains from indulging his appetite for them. But once the Supreme has been seen desire also departs. This is the meaning of this verse. Let us not imagine that we have mastered the senses when we have succeeded in pulling them away from objects of sense. By abstention is meant here not only the restraint of the tongue but of appetite in all its forms, in its widest sense. The word 'appetite' is used with a symbolic meaning. The first step in our *sādhanā* is the control of the desire to savour things of the senses. It is not the end but the beginning. For by the suppression of our external senses we win the strength and the firmness which enable us to cut out all desire from our inner selves. Real discipline, inner discipline, starts at this point. Our *sādhanā* will only come to an end when our inner appetites, all pleasure in flavour, have become completely denuded. The strength for this is developed through the practice of the control of the outer senses. That is why the *Gītā* has included the control of the outer senses among the distinguishing features of the Steadfast Wisdom.

To the epistemologist it is sufficient to say: 'Forgo all desires'. Nothing need be added. The exposition of the Steadfast Wisdom opens, therefore, in epistemological language. But the ways of a teacher differ from those of an epistemologist. A teacher keeps the preparation and ability of his pupil in mind when he addresses him. He tells the pupil plainly that he will not get his diploma until his course of study is completed but at the same time he instructs him daily. That is to say he guides the pupil with simple lessons and a compassionate concern for his welfare so that the pupil is encouraged to hope and persevere while at the same time he maintains the dignity of the doctrine. The *Gītā* is permeated with this compassionate concern. The example of the virtuous is the first lesson. When one lesson has been mastered a new one is taken up. Step by step the *Gītā* guides us. Saints and sādhanas, filled with concern for us, have ever told us that if a person calls upon God just once in full devotion he attains a vision of liberation. The direction of his life is changed. He turns to God. That does not mean he has reached his destination. But hope grows when a man knows where he is going. The task of the teacher, the guru, is to encourage him to hope more and more until he attains his goal.

The chief thing is that we must not relax our efforts until all desire has dried out of our hearts. Why so long? Some may protest that the suppression of our outer senses for such an extended period of time will result in hypocrisy. This argument will entangle those bent on self-destruction. Whether a *siddhant* is hypocritical or not, whether his *siddhant* is false or genuine, is immediately apparent for he must keep on trying until he has attained his end. Some duplicity between his conduct and his thoughts will inevitably develop. His mind may wander when he sits down to pray. It may be said, 'He does not really pray. He is only pretending.' Only a *siddhant* can be accused of pretending to pray in order to impose people. But he does not do that. He does not intend to deceive, so why should he be accused of doing so? Some have tried to interpret this verse of the *Gita* as meaning that it is hypocritical to suppress the outward senses until the mind has been brought under control. But that is not correct. It might have been possible to interpret it that way if the verse had read: *raam dhyaya param dhyatv atvavastu*. But '*vaat'pa*' is written here. The importance of maintaining control over the external senses is stressed by the word '*api*' which qualifies the word '*vaat*'. Implied also here is the idea that control of the external senses is not sufficient by itself and desire must be uprooted altogether. The effort to maintain control of the external senses until desire is entirely eliminated may fail, may prove futile. But it is not charlatanry. The control of the senses has two aspects, a rough or crude aspect and a subtle, discerning aspect. Both kinds of control must be practised if we are to arrive finally at the basic definition of the Steadfast Wisdom.

The finer, more subtle control of the senses is not accomplished until all desire has disappeared. How can it be done? The answer is that this is brought about by a vision of the *dharma*, of the Supreme, the *para-tattva*. *Para-tattva* means the doctrine of *para*, the Other, that which is the furthest from us. Actually it is the doctrine not of the Other, the most distant, but of the closest, of that which is nearest. Not *para-tattva* but *na-tattva*. The idea commonly held is opposed to this. The reason for the currency of the erroneous concept is our faulty reckoning. We begin our computations from the physical plane, the body, the flesh. The body is the most external part of us. Yet we think of it as being the most intimate, the closest part! Next comes the heart, the natural disposition. After that the *buddhi*, the intelligence. And after the *buddhi* we place the *atman*, the soul. In consequence of such a reversed reckoning what is closest to us becomes the furthest removed. The *Gita* itself points this out in the following line: *adhyatma paradyatv atadyatvishu param manusha*. Here the word '*para*' is used in the sense of 'supreme' and 'best', most 'infallible'. The *dharma* is these

things. Until we have beheld the *śloka* the mastery of the senses is not perfect. That is to say, we have been led right back to the first verse.

At this point someone usually protests: 'We have been roundly cheated with hopes of simpler methods of spiritual discipline! We have been seduced with a sweetmeat only to find a rod. Inner desire cannot be done away with so easily. How are we to go about it?' The way we are to go about it is now described. Before he proceeds, however, Kṛṣṇa answers the objectors.

*Yatato hyapi kṛanteyā puruṣaḥ saṁśalīlāḥ,
Indriyaṁ pramāṇīṁ haṛeṇī prastabham manoh.*

'Even though a man may ever strive and be ever so discerning, O son of Kuntī, his impetuous senses may carry off his mind by force.' This means that the senses are capable of leading astray even the most conscientious and diligent of men. Maṇu has a saying with similar implications. Many commentators take it to mean exactly the same thing.

*Mānava smṛtiḥ daktāḥ yā yā vivikṛāṇā bhāṇat,
Bhāṇat Indriya-grāhā, vidhivatsvapī haṛeṇī,*

This is what Maṇu says. It means: 'The senses are powerful. Therefore be careful even with your mother, your sister and your daughter. Given the opportunity the senses carry away even the learned.'

What Maṇu says is not, however, exactly what the Gītā says. Maṇu instructs common men how to conduct themselves, indicating certain social limits of behaviour. According to his own insight and in the light of prevailing conditions he lays down a safe rule of conduct for general use. He says in effect that a man should not trust himself beyond a certain point. It can by no means be assumed that he will always be able to control himself. The approach in the Gītā is metaphysical. What it writes is for *śāśvata*. There is no trace of mistrust or doubt. The Gītā does not say that the *śāśvata* is incapable of controlling his external senses. The ability to control them, to pull them away from objects of sense, is assumed. The Gītā acknowledges that the senses can be withheld from objects of sense at will. Moreover it insists upon the necessity of doing this. Maṇu does not expect so much. He is content to admonish the common man to be careful. The Gītā has a different purpose in view. It presents the metaphysical proposition that the senses, even after they have been withdrawn from the outward objects of sense, turn upon us and harass our hearts and

made. They try to fasten upon our thoughts. This sometimes is the cause of a mental indulgence which takes place even against our will. Sense control, in the more subtle sense, is not possible in such circumstances.

This happens even to those who watch their thoughts with the utmost care. The word 'aps' must be read into the verse in two places. 'Yasay kraye vpadatsh ap'. The word 'vpadatsh' is formed of 'vpad' and 'at'. 'Vpad' is the second number form of 'vjp'. 'Vjp' is the root of the word for wisdom. 'Vjpa' is a similar word. 'Vjp' means one who is wise. 'Vjpa' means one who is wise with a great wisdom. Even for such a one the mastery of the subtle sense is a difficult spiritual discipline. For these senses attempt to lead even his thoughts and feelings astray. This is what the Gñā wishes to tell us here.

Man has two strengths, the strength of knowledge and the strength of endurance. There is no third. I have availed myself of both these and found that, in spite of them, the senses are able to insert themselves into our feelings and wax strong. How hard it is to manage them! By a wise and careful man we mean a man armed with both knowledge and endurance. At the beginning of the Second Chapter such a man is described as a 'dñra'. The word 'dñra' is used in two senses. 'Dñ' means intelligence and 'dñra' means one who is intelligent, wise. But knowledge by itself does not enable a man to succeed in his spiritual adhvā. A man may be wise and yet be unable to survive. He cannot continue in that condition. Man has to endure unending trials, put up with tribulation and win through. Is knowledge enough? It is difficult to say so. The remark of a certain scientist has become famous. He was made to suffer terribly because he had declared that the earth revolves. 'Bring me your paper', he cried, 'I shall sign what you want me to sign'. He was asked to sign a statement that the earth does not revolve. Unbearable pain forced him to comply. When the paper was actually presented to him he said, 'What can I do? Even though I deny it the earth revolves, revolves, revolves!' Knowledge must be reinforced by the power to endure. Endurance is as necessary as intelligence. This meaning is also implicit in the word 'dñra'. In order to obtain it we must trace the origin of the word to the root 'dñ'. 'Dñra' means 'dñrañra', one who is patient, enduring. The Gñā uses it in both of its meanings.

Influence of Thoreau & Emerson on Gandhi's Satyagraha

GEORGE HENDRICK

Indian Opinion, the South African newspaper which was published by Gandhi from 1900 to 1914, contains much new material on his indebtedness to Thoreau and Emerson—the most prominent New England Transcendental writers. The influence of both of these writers upon him has long been known, but the supporting evidence has been incomplete: because *Indian Opinion* was not available. Gandhi, in his 1942 appeal 'To American Friends', wrote, 'You have given me a teacher in Thoreau, who furnished me through his essay, "On the Duty of Civil Disobedience", scientific confirmation of what I was doing in South Africa".¹

Similarly, Gandhi had written to Franklin Roosevelt in 1942, 'I have profited greatly by the writings of Thoreau and Emerson'.² Roger Baldwin, chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union, rode with Gandhi on a train trip through France in 1931 and noticed that the only valuable book was Thoreau's 'Civil Disobedience'. Baldwin remarked on the extent of Thoreau's doctrine, and Gandhi replied that the essay 'contained the essence of his political philosophy, not only as India's struggle related to the British, but as to his own views of the relation of citizens to government'.³

At the Second Round Table Conference in London that same

1. D.D. Thoreau, *Walden: Life of Mahatma Paramahansa Gandhi* (Bombay, 1930), VI, 177. Some new evidence on Gandhi's indebtedness to Emerson and Thoreau may appear in forthcoming volumes of the *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*.

2. *Ibid.*, VI, 144.

3. *Thoreau Society Bulletin*, XI, 2 (April, 1943).

year, the American reporter Webb Miller, a long-time admirer of Thoreau, asked Gandhi, 'Did you ever read an American named Henry D. Thoreau?'. Gandhi replied:

Why, of course I read Thoreau. I read *Walden* first in Johannesburg in South Africa in 1906 and his ideas influenced me greatly. I adopted some of them and recommended the study of Thoreau to all my friends who were helping me in the cause of Indian independence. Why, I actually took the name of my movement from Thoreau's essay, 'On the Duty of Civil Disobedience', written about eighty years ago. Until I read that essay I never found a suitable English translation for my Indian word, *satyagraha*. You remember that Thoreau invented and practised the idea of civil disobedience in Concord, Massachusetts, by refusing to pay his poll tax as a protest against the United States government. He went to jail, too. There is no doubt that Thoreau's ideas greatly influenced my movement in India.⁴

Miller noticed that Gandhi, a 'Hindu mystic', adopted from Thoreau the philosophy which was to affect millions of Indians and inspire them to defy the powerful British Empire. 'It would seem', Miller concluded, 'that Gandhi received back from America what was fundamentally the philosophy of India after it had been distilled and crystallised in the mind of Thoreau'.⁵

Because of lack of information, inaccuracies have been perpetuated. Henry Sidel Carby wrote in the March 1931 *Yale Review* that 'Civil Disobedience' came to Gandhi's attention while he was studying law in London in 1907.⁶ The *New York Evening Post* used this information in an editorial and then received a letter of correction and amplification from Henry S.L. Polak, Gandhi's co-worker in South Africa:

Mr Gandhi was not in 1907 'an obscure Hindu student' nor was he in London. He was already for fourteen years a barrister-at-law practising as a solicitor or attorney in South Africa. At the time in question he had already begun to organise his passive resistance movement in the Transvaal against certain anti-Indian laws that had already been passed by the Transvaal legislature.

4. Webb Miller, *I Found No Peace* (Garden City, 1938), pp. 218-219.

5. *Ibid.* (1).

6. Henry Sidel Carby, 'Thoreau and the Machine Age', *Yale Review*, XX, 317 (March 1931).

I cannot recall whether, early in 1907, he or I first came across the volume of Thoreau's essays (published, I believe, in Scott's Library) but we were both of us enormously impressed by the confirmation of the rightness of the principle of passive resistance and civil disobedience that had been started against the objectionable laws, contained in the essay 'On the Duty of Civil Disobedience'.

After consultation with Mr Ghandi I reproduced the essay in the columns of *Indian Opinion* and it was translated into the Gujarati language, in which, as well as in English, the paper was published, and the essay was subsequently circulated in pamphlet form later in the same year. *Indian Opinion* organised an essay competition on 'The Ethics of Passive Resistance', with special reference to Thoreau's essay and Socialist writings that had already come to Mr Ghandi's notice.⁷

Ghandi's letter to Henry Salt on Thoreau's influence contradicts some of Polak's statement. Henry S. Salt, one of Thoreau's earliest biographers, was interested in writing the life of Ghandi and undoubtedly would have studied Ghandi's indebtedness to Thoreau but was discouraged from writing by G.B. Shaw, who said that there was nothing more to be said about saints after his play on Joan of Arc.⁸ Salt, however, did write to Ghandi, whom he had first met in London in the 1880s, asking about the influence of Thoreau. Ghandi replied, in a letter which has often been reprinted, that 'Civil Disobedience' had 'left a deep impression' upon him and that he had

... translated a portion for the readers of *Indian Opinion* in South Africa which I was then editing, and I made copious extracts for the English part of the paper. The essay seemed to be so convincing and truthful that I felt the need of knowing more of Thoreau, and I came across your Life of him, his *Walden*, and other essays, all of which I read with great pleasure and equal profit.⁹

The whole essay, as Polak intimated, was not reprinted, but only extracts from it. It is most likely that in consultation with Polak, Ghandi marked those passages which he wished published. The editor of the extracts in *Indian Opinion* did not sign the article, but, in his letter to Salt, Ghandi is positive that he was responsible. The extracts were made, not from the volume in Scott's Library, but from Arthur

7. *New York Evening Post*, 11 May 1911, p. 1.

8. Stephen Winstan, *Salt and His Circle* (London, 1941), p. 170.

9. Henry S. Salt, *Company I Have Kept* (London, 1892), pp. 100-101.

C. Pinfold's Simple Life edition of the essay, and were presented under the headline 'For Pastors Remotely'.

The extracts began with a quotation from Tolstoy:—'The principle of State necessity can bind only those men who disobey God's law, who for the sake of worldly advantages try to reconcile the irreconcilable; but a Christian who sincerely believes that the fulfilment of Jesus' teaching shall bring him salvation cannot attach any importance to this principle'—and then gave a short biographical sketch of David Thoreau who 'taught nothing he was not prepared to practise in himself'. Thoreau was extolled as one who went to jail 'for the sake of his principles and suffering humanity'. The five columns of extracts from 'Civil Disobedience' present Thoreau's argument forcefully and accurately, emphasising that the essay's 'incursive logic is unanswerable'.¹⁰

The extracts present in brief the main ideas of Thoreau's closely argued essay. The following passage, basic to Gandhi's philosophy of *satyagraha* as many other sections of 'Civil Disobedience' were, well demonstrates Gandhi's method of extracting the heart of an idea from essays:

Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also prison. . . .

If any think that their influence would be lost there, and their voices no longer afflict the ear of the State, that they would not be as an empty without its walls, they do not know by how much truth is stronger than error, nor how much more eloquently and effectively he can combat injustice who has experienced a little in his own person.

Cast your whole vote, not a strip of paper merely, but your whole influence. A minority is powerless while it conforms to the majority; it is not even a minority then; but it is irresistible when it clogs by its whole weight.

If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate which to choose. If a thousand men were not to pay their tax-bills this year, that would not be a violent and bloody measure as it would be to pay them, and enable the State to commit violence and shed innocent blood.¹¹

There can be no doubt about the appeal of Thoreau's essay, which

10. *Indian Opinion*, 26 October 1907, p. 432.

11. *Ibid.*, pp. 439-440.

Gandhi read at a crucial phase of his life. He was then fighting the 'Black Act' which required all Amrites over eight years of age residing in the Transvaal to register and, as if they were criminals, give their fingerprints. Failure to register would result in a fine, a prison term, or deportation. 'I have never known legislation of this nature', Gandhi wrote, 'being directed against free men in any part of the world'.¹²

Indian Opinion helped awaken the Indians to the danger, and when the protest meeting was called for 11 September 1907, in Johannesburg, delegates representing all segments of the 13,000 Indians in the Transvaal were present. The Fourth Resolution passed that day declared that Indians would not submit to the Ordinance and would suffer all the penalties for their disobedience. Seth Hiji Habib while seconding the resolution declared that it should be passed with God as witness; Gandhi, sensing the effectiveness of a religious vow, made an impassioned speech of support, ending:

Even then there is only one course open to the likes of me, to do; but not to submit to the law. It is quite unlikely, but even if everyone else flinched. . . I am confident that I would never violate my pledge. . . Although we are going to take the pledge in a body, no-one should imagine that default on the part of one or many can absolve the rest from their obligation. Everyone should fully realize his responsibility, then only pledge himself independently of others and understand that he himself must be true to his pledge even unto death, no matter what others do.¹³

Gandhi entitled the chapter describing this meeting 'The Advent of Satyagraha'. Although this meeting was held five weeks before the extracts from 'Civil Disobedience' were published in *Indian Opinion*, he undoubtedly already knew Thoreau's philosophy. On 7 September 1907, four days before the meeting in the Imperial Theatre, *Indian Opinion* commented on the Archbishop of Canterbury's request that the clergy should not celebrate marriages with one's deceased wife's sister, even though such marriages were permitted by English law. An unsigned article in *Indian Opinion* stated:

Rightly or wrongly, His Grace believes that there is no warrant for such unions in the Bible and that, therefore, the Legislature has committed a breach of God's law, which it would be irreligious for the clergy to countenance. In other words, he has recognised what Thoreau has said, that we should be men before we

12. M. K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha in South Africa* (Madras, 1924), pp. 157-158.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 160-161.

are subjects, and that there is no obligation imposed upon us by our conscience to give blind submission to any law, no matter what force or majority backs it.

Such is also the position of British Indians in the Transvaal. Law-abiding they are, and it will take away nothing from the certificate they have enjoyed so long by their now refusing to accept registration under the Asiatic Law, which their conscience rejects as degrading to their manhood and offensive to their religion. It is possible to carry the doctrine of passive resistance too far, but it is equally so with reference to the doctrine of obedience to the law. We cannot give the dividing line in words more appropriate than those of Thoreau: when speaking of the American Government he says: 'If one were to tell me that this was a bad Government because it taxed certain foreign commodities brought to its ports, it is most probable that I should not make an ado about it, for I can do without them. All machines have friction, and possibly this does enough good to counter-balance the evil. At any rate, it is a great evil to make a stir about it. But when the friction comes to have its machine, and oppression and robbery are paramount, I say, let us not have such a machine any longer.' In the Asiatic Registration Act, British Indians have not only a law which has some evil in it, that is to say, using Thoreau's words, a machine with friction in it, but it is evil legalsed, or it represents friction with machinery provided for it. Resistance to such an evil is a divine duty. . . .¹⁴

It is true, then, that Thoreau's writings were known to Gandhi during the formative period of the first antylograha movement: 'During ten years', he wrote, 'that is, until 1914 . . . there was hardly an issue of *Indian Opinion* without an article from me'.¹⁵

There is every reason to believe that Gandhi read carefully every article in his publication. Though never a wide reader, he did believe in putting into practice ideas which he had accepted. Even in 1907 he attempted to follow the injunction of the Gita that ends and means should be the same—that a sincere man's words and actions should not be at variance. Gandhi may well have read *Walden* as early as 1906; before the first antylograha movement he had dispensed with servants, acted as his own scavenger, and was striving to be independent of machinery. His views were seemingly greatly influenced by *Walden*,

14. *Indian Opinion*, 7 September 1907, p. 363.

15. M. K. Gandhi, *Autobiography* (Washington, 1947), p. 348.

but since he was using *The Times* as a pattern for *Indian Opinion*, his journalistic endeavours did not reflect his personal interests as his later papers in India did, and his reactions to *Walden* were not discussed in the paper. Rather, it was the Thoreau who went to jail 'for the sake of his principles and suffering humanity' who was emphasized in *Indian Opinion* because of the confirmation found there of the non-cooperation campaign.

Readers of *Indian Opinion* were not allowed to forget Thoreau's essay on civil disobedience. Thoreau had opposed the enslavement of men, Indians, being enslaved themselves, needed encouragement in their struggle. The Indian community was openly defying the registration act, and the resistance of Thoreau, Tolstoy, Jesus, and Socrates seemed vital confirmation to Gandhi. *Indian Opinion* announced an essay contest on 'The Ethics of Passive Resistance', on 9 November 1907:

As this journal has, in a humble way, led the battle of passive resistance now being offered by the Indians in the Transvaal against an Act which, in their opinion, does violence to their conscience; and as the controllers of the policy of this journal are desirous of showing the general utility of the doctrine of passive resistance, the management have decided to offer, as they now do, a prize of Ten Guineas for the best Essay on 'The Ethics of Passive Resistance'. The doctrine, religiously construed, means a fulfilment of Jesus' famous saying, 'Resist not evil'. As such, it is of eternal and unvaried application, and if it were practised largely, it would replace, to a great extent, if not entirely, brute force and other kindred methods for securing redress of grievances or inauguration of reforms. The management, therefore, trusts that the best men of South Africa, having leisure, will compete for the prize, not for its monetary value, but with a view to an elucidation of a principle of life which, although it has the sanction of the best minds of the world, is still little understood and less practised.

The terms of the competition stated that the essay should contain an examination 'of Thoreau's choice, "On the Duty of Civil Disobedience", Tolstoy's works—more especially *The Kingdom of Heaven is Within You* . . . and also the application of the "Apology of Socrates" to the question'.¹⁶ Those who entered the essay competition had access to *Civil Disobedience*, as it had been reprinted in pamphlet form for sale at 3d. and issued in time to be used by contestants not familiar with the essay.¹⁷ Emerson also had access to an article on Socrates almost beyond question

16. *Indian Opinion*, 9 November 1907, p. 463.

17. *Indian Opinion*, 23 November 1907, p. 464.

written by Gândhî. Pôlad's letter to the New York *Evening Post* mentioned that 'Socrates' writings' had come to the attention of Gândhî before the contest had been announced; Gândhî was reading Socrates during his jail term in January 1906, and his paraphrase of the *Defence and Death of Socrates*, entitled *The Story of a Sacrifice*, seemingly published only in Gujarât, was banned in India in 1919.¹⁶ Socrates is interpreted as a man of principle following his conscience and making no attempt to escape the consequences of his civil disobedience. The essay, entitled 'Socrates as Passive Resister', in addition to the direct reference to Thoreau, is permeated with Thoreauvian views on the rights of minorities and the divinity of the conscience:

For [Socrates] when there was to be a choice between his conscience—what he knew to be good—and what the government of the day had ordered, and what he knew to be wrong, there was no hesitation even though it might have cost him his life. Indeed, his trial was a brilliant example of passive resistance. He had been preaching virtue to the Athenian youth. This tended to subvert the established order of thought and, therefore, established authority. Socrates was, therefore, charged, among other things, with having corrupted the Athenians. The penalty was death. Socrates preferred the poison-bowl and his independence to a life of servile and ungentlemanly obedience to human authority, even when it went under the name of government. 'O Athenians', says our sage, 'I honour and love you; but I shall obey God rather than you'. At the same memorable defence, Socrates says of his most virulent and self-seeking traducers, 'Neither will Melitus nor Anytus harm me; nor have they the power; for I do not think that it is possible for a better man to be injured by a worse. He may perhaps have me condemned to death, or banished, or deprived of civil right; and he or others may perhaps consider these as mighty evils. I, however, do not consider them so.' Not many days after he uttered the memorable words, he died a peaceful death, decouraging on the immortality of the soul. The world knows today Melitus and his companions as murderers of a man almost divine, and Socrates lives for eternity. This passive resister, just after the sentence was pronounced upon him, delivered in his dungeon a discourse on the duties of a good citizen, and rejected the overtures of his friends to escape death by stealing out of the prison. Then, he was as hard as adamant and all respect for law and order. In Socrates, therefore, we have one of the greatest breakers as also respecters of law. The essence of his teaching and practice was

16. Tondakur, *Mahatma*, I, 293.

that it is lawful to disregard a law or order when it is against one's conscience, i.e., a higher law, but it is not lawful to try to escape the punishment that the law imposes for such disregard.

And such is the Indian position today as the Transvaal Indians are law-abiding. They will, therefore, suffer all the penalties that the law they refuse to respect may provide for them. The test of good citizenship is not necessarily an acceptance of everything that law-givers may have to say. That would entail a travesty of good government, national stagnation, and destruction of the rights of minorities. But the minorities who consider certain laws or orders to be wrong must, by not resisting evil, suffer in their persons the penalties for a breach of those laws, until their sufferings have produced a reaction in their favour. Acquiescence in a law which is repugnant to one's notion of right is nothing but rank cowardice, for it shows disinclination to submit to physical inconvenience. Thomas wisely said: 'There are nine hundred and ninety-nine patrons of virtue to one virtuous man. But it is easier to deal with the real possessor of a thing than with the temporary guardian of it'. And passive resisters are, beyond doubt, the real possessors of 'the thing'; when they have lost all, they have gained everything.¹⁹

The essay on 'The Ethics of Passive Resistance' was to be judged by the Reverend Dr J. Landau, who announced that he in no way entered into 'the merits of the political application of the principle of passive resistance'.²⁰ The entry deadline was extended from 30 November to 31 December, possibly because of a limited number of essays. Only four essays were eventually to be entered in the contest, and before the essays were judged, Gandhi, who had refused to register, was arrested. He was sentenced on 10 January 1906 to two months' simple imprisonment. Gandhi remembered that there was a 'slight feeling of awkwardness due to the fact that I was standing as an accused in the very Court where I had often appeared as counsel'. He then added a Thoreauvian comment: 'But I well remember that I considered the former role as far more honourable than the latter, and did not feel the slightest hesitation in entering the prisoner's box'.²¹

During the first incarceration, Gandhi read Tolstoy, Ruskin, Scotts, Huxley, Bacon, and the Gita—the work which greatly influenced

19. *Indian Opinion*, 18 November 1905, p. 475.

20. *Indian Opinion*, 30 November 1905, p. 508.

21. Gandhi, *Autobiography in South Africa*, p. 132.

him, as it did Thoreau, as Arthur C. Christy in *The Orient in American Transcendentalism* has shown. Since his days in London when he had first studied the *Gita* Gandhi had rejected the fundamentalist interpretation that this Hindu Bible was an historical work justifying violence. Gandhi felt that 'under the guise of physical warfare, it described the duel that perpetually went on in the hearts of mankind, and that physical warfare was brought in merely to make the description of the internal duel more alluring'.²² Thoreau, in his criticism of the *Gita* in *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack River*, had protested the seeming justification of violence; Gandhi undoubtedly knew of Thoreau's interest in oriental literature through his reading of Widdow and Salt's *Life of Henry David Thoreau*, although he seemingly never saw *A Week* with its extended comments on the *Gita*.

A settlement calling for voluntary rather than compulsory registration for Indians was arrived at and Gandhi's days of reading were cut short. Gandhi did not forget Thoreau's essay on civil disobedience; *Indian Opinion*, on 18 April 1908, printed the prize-essay 'The Ethics of Passive Resistance'. As Dr Landau had withdrawn from judging the contest because of political implications, Reverend J. J. Duke read the first four essays submitted and awarded the first prize to M. S. Mawson. *Indian Opinion* carefully pointed out that the essay which won did not reach the level which it had hoped for; it was indeed a pedestrian production; the section on Thoreau was largely a reproduction of the extracts which *Indian Opinion* had printed, and the sections on Tolstoy, Ruskin, and Jesus were uninspired.²³

The continued interest in civil disobedience was justified, as General Smuts refused to keep his bargain to repeal the compulsory registration act after the Indians had voluntarily registered. Gandhi was unwilling to tolerate Smuts's breach of faith; an Indian statement was sent stating that if the Asiatic Act were not repealed the registration certificates of the Indians would be burned. Gandhi's mission may well have come from reading Salt's biography of Thoreau; Thoreau's essay on 'Slavery in Massachusetts'. Salt noted, '... was delivered at an address at the anti-slavery celebration at Farringham in 1854, on which occasion the Constitution of the United States was publicly burned by Lloyd Garrison, an incident which may explain the passionate tone of Thoreau's paper'.²⁴

22. Gandhi, *The Gita According to Gandhi* (Ahmedabad, 1931), p. 127.

23. *Indian Opinion*, 18 April 1908, pp. 175-177.

24. Salt, *Life of Henry David Thoreau* (London, 1896.), p. 144. I have been unable to date Gandhi's reading of the Salt biography; there was interest in Garrison among the workers of *Indian Opinion* at this time, however, as the paper ran extracts from Garrison's works on 19 March 1900.

The certificates were burned on 16 August 1908, and Gandhi was arrested and sentenced to the Volkarust prison on 10 October 1908. He worked all during the day, but in the mornings and evenings on Sundays he read. He read 'the two famous books of Ruskin, *Essays of Thoreau*', and parts of the Bible, the *Essays of Bacon*, and several books in Gujarati. 'From Thoreau and Ruskin', he wrote, 'I could find out arguments in favour of our fight'.²⁵

Gandhi wrote that many people wondered why one should go to jail where one had to submit to personal restraints, wear the coarse, ugly garb of, and share quarters with, felons, live upon a 'non-nutritious and semi-starvation diet', and be maltreated by jail officials, separated from friends and relatives and even prohibited from writing to them. 'Such thoughts', Gandhi wrote, in describing his second jail experiences, 'make one really a coward, and being in constant dread of a jail life, deter him from undertaking to perform services in the interests of his country which might otherwise prove very valuable'.²⁶

Gandhi believed that it was the 'height of one's good fortune to be in jail in the interests and good name of one's country and religion'. In jail the necessities of life were provided and the soul was left free; the body was restrained, but not the soul. A non-violent warden merely taught self-control to the prisoner. Gandhi trusted 'that the readers of this, my second experience of life in the Transvaal jail, will be convinced that the real road to ultimate happiness lies in going to jail and undergoing sufferings and privations there in the interest of one's country and religion'.²⁷

He ended his account of his second jailing by adding: 'Placed in a similar position for refusing his poll-tax, the American citizen, Thoreau, expressed similar thoughts in 1849. Seeing the walls of the cell in which he was confined, made of solid stone two or three feet thick and the door of wood and iron a foot thick, he said to himself thus:

"I saw that, if there was a wall of stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still more difficult one to climb or break through before they could get to be as free as I was. I did not feel for a moment confined, and the walls seemed a great waste of stone and mortar. I felt as if I alone of all my townsmen had paid my tax. They plainly did not know how to treat me, but

25. Gandhi, *Servitude and Swifdom* (Madras, 1917), p. 226.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 228.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 227.

behaved like persons who are underhired. In every threat and in every compliment there was a blunder; for they thought that my chief desire was to stand on the other side of the stone-wall. I could not but smile to see how industriously they locked the door on my meditations which followed them out again without let or hindrance, and they were nearly all that was dangerous. As they could not reach me, they resolved to punish my body; just as boys, if they cannot come to some person against whom they have a spite, will abuse his dog. I saw that the State was half-witted, that it was as timid as a lone woman with her silver spoons, and that it did not know its friends from its foes, and I lost all my remaining respect for it and piled it."²⁸

Gandhi's transformation from a respectable lawyer to a radical political leader was complete.

Thoreau was not ignored during the years after *sepydgrake* was first tried; for several years after 1908 passive resistance was offered on a small scale, and Gandhi himself did not court arrest. Two years after *Indian Opinion* had printed extracts from 'Civil Disobedience', it printed selections from Mazzini with the comment: "We believe that when the first stage of passive resistance was at its height, the extracts we gave from Thoreau's essay 'On the Duty of Civil Disobedience' were very greatly appreciated by Indian passive resisters."²⁹ And Gandhi himself was still reading Thoreau. By 1909 he considered that 'railways, machineries and the corresponding increase of indulgent habits are the true badge of slavery of the Indian people, as they are of Europeans'.³⁰ Thoreau and Tolstoy had said the same thing, and their influence is particularly strong in Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* (Indian Home Rule), a severe castigation of the evils of Western imperialism which enslaved colonial peoples and brought material prosperity to the governing nations. Works by Tolstoy, Ruskin, and Edward Carpenter, and Thoreau's 'On the Duty of Civil Disobedience' and 'Life Without Principle' were among the sources listed in the bibliography, and in a Preface to *Hind Swaraj* printed in *Indian Opinion*, Gandhi stated: "Whilst the views expressed in *Hind Swaraj*, are held by me, I have but endeavoured humbly to follow Tolstoy, Ruskin, Thoreau, Emerson and other writers, besides the masters of Indian philosophy."³¹ *Hind Swaraj*, banned in India, was a call for

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 127-128.

29. *Indian Opinion*, 20 February 1908, pp. 29-30.

30. *Tendulkar, Mahatma*, I, 127.

31. *Indian Opinion*, 2 April 1910, p. 100.

individual. Thoreauian regeneration and shows that in 1909, six years before he was to leave South Africa, Gandhi was beginning to think of Indian affairs. One year after the publication of *Hind Swaraj*, *Indian Opinion* published excerpts from 'Life Without Principle', under the title 'Thoughts from Thoreau'.³²

These extracts, condemning commerce, government, and intellectual stagnation, must have delighted Gandhi. The middle-class lawyer Gandhi suffered a conversion in South Africa which made him discard almost all aspects of his old life and beliefs and turn to writers who probed the meaning of civilization. Once Gandhi adopted and modified Thoreau-vian-Tolstoyan-Ruskinian principles, he acted without hesitation and with determination.

The man who was to become a saint to millions of Indians, echoing Thoreau, chided Mrs Mills Polak when she wanted to spend money for curtains. Gandhi's protest that she would only shut out the view of the beautiful mountains was not with the argument that pictures and curtains would damage the cheapness of the house. Gandhi was adamant; pointing to the beautiful scenery, he asked, 'Why do you want to clutter yourself with things that will only need more time to be spent upon them? You say you want beauty. You have it around you. God has given you the reality; why, then, worry about the things made by man?'³³

Thoreau's influence upon Gandhi, F. I. Carpenter has written, 'may partly be credited to Emerson's teaching, even if indirectly'.³⁴ Although Thoreau's influence upon Gandhi was far greater, Emerson directly influenced the Mahatma. Gandhi was reading Emerson during his second imprisonment in South Africa and he wrote to his son on 25 March 1909 that Emerson, Ruskin, and Mazzini 'confirm the view that education does not mean a knowledge of letters but it means character building'.³⁵ Later in the same letter he wrote, 'Please tell Mahatmaji that I would advise him to read Emerson's essays. . . . There is a cheap reprint out. These essays are worth studying. He should read them, mark the important passages and then finally copy them out in a notebook. The essays to my mind contain the teaching of Indian wisdom in a western garb. It is interesting to see our own sometimes thus differently fashioned'.³⁶

32. *Indian Opinion*, 10 June 1911, pp. 120-231, 21 July 1911, p. 287.

33. Mills Graham Polak, *Mr Gandhi*. *The Man* (Bombay, 1950), p. 38.

34. F. I. Carpenter, *Emerson Handout* (New York, 1937), p. 131.

35. Louis Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (New York, 1950), p. 91.

36. *Id.*, p. 93.

Four years earlier *Indian Opinion* had printed the following extract from Emerson's 'The Over-Soul', an extract which Gandhi undoubtedly saw:

The supreme deity on the errors of the past and the present, and the only prophet of that which must be, is that great Nature in which we rest, as the earth lies in the soft arms of the atmosphere: that Unity, that Over-Soul, within which every man's particular being is contained and made one with all others; that common heart, of which all sincere conversation is the worship; to which all right action is submission; that overpowering reality which confuses our tricks and talents and constrains everyone to pass for what he is, and to speak from his tongue, and which evermore tends to become wisdom, and virtue, and power, and beauty. . . . From within or from behind, a light shines through us upon things, and makes us aware that we are nothing, but the light is all. A man is the facade of a temple wherein all wisdom and all good abide. What we commonly call man, the eating, drinking, planning, counting man, does not, as we know him, represent himself. Him we do not respect, but the soul, whose organ he is, would he let it appear through his action, would make our knees bend. When it breathes through his intellect, it is genius; when it breathes through his will, it is virtue; when it flows through his affection, it is love. EMERSON.³⁷

Gandhi, although influenced by Emerson the guru, felt as many others have felt that Emerson was too much the inactive intellectual. In commenting on scriptures and non-violence, he wrote: 'But the fact remains that religious books have a hold upon mankind which other books have not. They have made a greater impression on me than Mark Twain, or, to take a more appropriate instance, Emerson. Emerson was a thinker, Mahomed and Jesus were through and through men of action in a sense Emerson would never be.'³⁸

Thoreau undoubtedly had a greater influence upon Gandhi than did Emerson because the Walden philosopher was a practical man willing to practise his beliefs. Both writers did, however, offer confirmation of Gandhi's own ideas, and the Mahatma was especially indebted to the Thoreau who defied society and government to follow his conscience.

37. *Indian Opinion*, 15 February 1905, p. 164.

38. *Tiredaker, Mahomed*, IV, 161-162. The Editors of the *New England Quarterly* and the *Emerson Society Quarterly* granted permission for me to republish portions from my article on Gandhi which appeared in their magazines.

Gandhi and the Revolutionary Socialist Party

TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI

As a party believing in Marxist scientific socialism, the ideological moorings of the Revolutionary Socialist Party are fundamentally different from those of Gandhism. The direct political or ideological influence of Gandhi upon the RSP has therefore been rather limited. But no political party or section of political thought that was active in this country in recent times was able to keep itself completely insulated from the objective impact exercised by Gandhi and his ideas upon contemporary events. Every one of us was irresistibly drawn into the vast sweep of the elemental mass movements that were released by him and, consciously or unconsciously, the vision and outlook of our generation of men and women inevitably came to be influenced and shaped by his ideas.

No Marxist or Revolutionary Socialist could afford to lose sight of the fact that Gandhi constituted by himself the biggest single political factor in the national life of India during the past three or four decades. The entire national movement of India and the struggle for independence were dominated during this period by his amazing personality and by his ideas. The theory and technique of direct political mass-action, symbolised by his message of 'non-violent resistance' to foreign rule, threw up the most effective challenge to British power in India. As everybody knows, it was the sustained pressure and never-ceasing threat implicit in this idea of non-violent resistance spread broadcast in the minds of the vast masses of this country, who were already powerfully moved even before the advent of Gandhi by yearnings for political freedom and independent nationhood, that eventually compelled the British rulers of India to relinquish power. This is the genesis of the national independence which our people enjoy today and of India's emergence as

the world community of nations as a sovereign Democratic Republic. It goes without saying that the ideas and personality of the man who played the biggest role in the making of our history in modern times could not but leave its imprint on the texture of political thinking of all political parties, whether of the right or of the left, and even of parties whose sources for ideological inspiration have been basically different. The RSP has been no exception to this general rule.

In order to assess the extent to which the political thinking of the RSP has come to be influenced by Gandhi it will be necessary to bear in mind one or two things about the RSP itself. Ideologically a Marxist working-class party, the RSP has grown up in the closest possible association with the national struggle against imperialism and an active participation in that struggle in the course of the last three decades. A major section of its active cadres was drawn in the beginning from the underground revolutionary movement which believed in armed action and in the unavoidable necessity of resorting to violence against the foreign imperialist rulers of the country. A good section also came from the militant elements active in the more recent phases of the national struggle or in the trade-union and *kudis* movements. Marxism and the class-struggle outlook notwithstanding (or, because of what the RSP regards as its correct understanding of Marxism), the political and ideological orientations of the party have been, till recently, nationalist and anti-imperialist in the main. The anti-capitalist class-struggle aspects of its Marxist faith have been coming more to the forefront since the British left the country; but the anti-imperialist and nationalist orientations are still there. Moreover, although the RSP shares the international outlook common to all Marxist working-class parties, due to a number of historical reasons (the details of which would not be very relevant in the present context), the RSP has preferred to keep clear of all extra-territorial political or organisational affiliations. Certain regrettable features of Stalinist rule in Soviet Russia which have come in for all-round condemnation recently, and the close identification of the program and tactics of the Communist International and the post-Second-World-War Cominform with the changing exigencies of the foreign-policy line of the Soviet State, inhibited RSP from seeking any help or political affiliation in these quarters. The Trotskyist Fourth International was much too inchoate, faction-ridden, and much too preoccupied with theoretical squabbles about the meaning of developments that were taking place in the Soviet world and with feeble attempts to try down everything that was taking place there, to evoke hopes of effective international action for furthering the cause of working people in India. The accidental disentanglement from extra-territorial political loyalties, together with its

closeness to the more abiding traditions of India's national struggle, enabled RSP to regard the various aspects of the latter more correctly and consistently, with greater sympathy and a deeper discernment of its positive role than has been usual in some other Marxist circles.

Because it has always stood very close to the national mass movement led by Gandhi and was a part of that movement regarded broadly, it was easier for the RSP to discern the positive political content of Gandhism and also to benefit from it to a large extent. *It could now in proper perspective the great historic significance of the Gandhian technique of direct mass action which placed unshattering reliance on the creative political role of the common masses of the people and on their independent initiative for action.* Aided by its Marxist socio-historic outlook the RSP could very well see that this appeal to disciplined mass action and mass initiative immediately opened up a new dimension in our political struggle and imparted to it a depth, volume and momentum hitherto unknown. It widened the social base of the movement unprecedentedly and tapped for it never-fading resources of power. It offered much even for Marxists to learn from, for building the mass base of their own movement in the coming phase. This discernment gradually enabled the RSP to probe deeper and realise that, whatever may be the apparent limitations of Gandhism from the standpoint of the scientific, sociological and economic analysis advocated by Marx, the ultimate aspiration for the idealism of Gandhi, as well as for that of Marx, came from the great importance which both of them laid on basic human values. Any India brought up in the traditional humanism so common in the religions of this country and its popular culture would not have to search far for the humanism that inspired Gandhi. But later-day Marxists, habituated to deriving their political ideas and programs from a completely amoral, power-oriented outlook about men and events, have so much dehumanised Marx that any reference here to 'Marxist' humanism may sound a little strange and may even evoke a measure of scepticism. So far as the RSP is concerned, however, it would be quite correct to say that its ability to appreciate the deeper mass content and humanism of Gandhian ideas gave it the insight simultaneously to re-discover for itself the identical aspiration of humanism inherent in Marxism. This could happen because the RSP grew up in the way it did, in intimate association with the national movement and in active participation in the national struggle, and also because it sought to evolve for itself a tradition of critical non-conformism, which it eventually came to regard as the essence of Marxism. As a result, the RSP's outlook in the appreciation of the creative and positive aspects of Gandhian thought was more consistent and objective than it would have been if its judgment were not ideologically mortgaged before-

head to political exigencies originating outside the country and having no relevance to the demands of popular mass struggles within its frontiers.

M Marxists in general have always been rather prone to regard Gandhism, from the *revolutionary class-struggle* point of view of Marxism, as the ideology of *reformism*, both in its socio-economic as well as political aspects. It must be plainly admitted that we did not like and often criticised very sharply what appeared to us as the in-born psychological inhibition of Gandhism and its inability to break with the existing scheme of things, even when it was opposed to the latter and urged the people to resistance. It is also true that on occasions Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence has been so interpreted and brought into play as to be identified with this reformism. On such occasions the RSP, in common with all other Marxist parties, sought to give a rational social explanation to the whole complex of Gandhian ideology by referring it to the economic class-interests of the Indian capitalist class or to the private-property sentiments of the Indian petty-bourgeoisie and the peasantry. It is true that his mode of thinking never consciously transcended the framework of bourgeois property relationship. In that fundamental sociological sense it was perfectly correct and legitimate to define the socio-economic class character of Gandhi's thought in terms of the class outlook of the Indian bourgeoisie, which was opposed to the foreign imperialist strangle-hold upon their market but never wanted that opposition to develop in a way that might jeopardise their vested interests to the slightest degree. It is very doubtful if the Indian capitalists would have acquiesced in Gandhi's ideas of mass resistance to imperialist rule, if it had not been for his simultaneous emphasis on non-violence and the subsequent elaboration of his well-known ideas 'trusteeship' and class-collaboration. As a matter of fact, the Indian capitalists had greater faith in the essentially reformist significance of Gandhian non-violence than anybody else and their understanding of Gandhism certainly never overstepped their own vital class interests in the narrowest sense. But for all that, it would be fundamentally wrong to call him an 'agent' of the Indian capitalist class in the sense that some Marxists have sometimes wanted to characterize him in disparagement.

It is historically on record that on more occasions than one, Gandhi came out openly against capitalist exploitation of workers and of the common people, and urged them to fight against that exploitation and to resist it in the same manner and with the same weapons as those with which he called upon them to oppose and resist foreign rule. According

to the RSP's understanding of Gandhism, the most important, vital and creative element in Gandhian thought has been his unswerving fidelity to the dignity of the human personality and his fundamental opposition to anything that would undermine that dignity in the slightest degree or threat in any manner the right of every human being to live and to 'be'. His opposition to foreign imperialism did not spring from any idea of narrow racial chauvinism, nor did his opposition to big machines or appearances of modern industrialism arise from any ecclesiastical faith in the virtues and efficacy of cottage industry and handicrafts. His opposition to imperialism as well as to economic exploitation had the same basic inspiration viz., the idea of not submitting to anything that denied or thwarted the essential dignity of the human personality; for that according to him would be a submission to evil. This humanistic approach has been, according to the RSP's understanding of Gandhian thought, the sole and basic criterion by which Gandhi eventually came to judge every political and social question that confronted him. Anything that denied the value of the human personality, or sought to dominate it or subjugate it by physical force against its own free will, was regarded by him as 'violence', or 'untruth' which must be resisted at any cost. He was a votary of non-violence in that fundamental sense and not in the sense of seeking to reconcile himself, in a spirit of opportunism, to any particular form of society or the powers that might rule over that society for the time being. To say the least, he was absolutely incapable of that kind of opportunism or compromise.

Where however we found Gandhi wanting, or his thought-processes a little too hailing for us, was in his unilateral reliance on his characteristic empirical and humanist approach even in the analysis of institutional, social and economic questions, as also in his attempts to find a solution for them by identical means, when they demanded an objective scientific approach and tackling by appropriate analytical methods of science. To find an answer, for instance, to the question of how modern imperialism or capitalist industrialism has emerged in our times, an explanation in terms of human greed for power and material wealth is not enough. The Gandhian approach to the numerous social and economic problems that confront us today and the solutions that he suggested for them often had therefore the imprint of not rising above the empirical humanism, which is not necessarily the surest and most dependable guide in these matters.

The RSP has, therefore, been less influenced by the specific solutions that he came to suggest for the maladjustments and social conflicts of today. For example, it has not felt the impact of his 'trusteeship' theory

as a method for ensuring class harmony in society, in the same way or to the same extent as it has felt the ideological impact of his techniques of mass resistance in the national struggle against India's imperialist rulers or against all forms of exploitation of man by man. Here, in this particular instance, the impact of ideas has eventually led to the recognition of the necessity of a certain re-orientation and re-emphasis in concrete policies and programs as well. We need not go into the details here. The resultant re-orientation that has come about in the political thinking and programmatic approach of RSP to various crucial questions of the day has been, as has been indicated already, more by way of attempts at a greater and closer understanding of Gandhi's humanistic mass approach and also by way of the emulation of his technique of mass action as the most effective weapon of resistance against political oppression and social injustice. Unfortunately, recent research in Gandhian thought has not devoted the same attention to this Gandhian art and science of dealing with large numbers of human beings as masses, his method of evoking self-confidence and a creative response in them, of building up their initiative step by step and then hurking them into action in a disciplined manner at the crucial historic moment etc., as might be desired. The secret by which he unravelled his way to the minds of men, both as individuals and in the mass, still largely remains a secret, for that was the secret of his leadership over man. But there can be hardly any doubt that the manner in which he identified himself with the ideas, hopes and aspirations of the common masses and could yet impart to their thinking something of his own nobility and fearlessness, opens up a very large sphere for research and experimentation by all students of human affairs.

As the political party of the toiling people, it has been RSP's endeavour in the present phase of our struggle against poverty, exploitation and inequality to learn and imitate as much as may be possible or necessary of that humanism and mass approach which made Gandhi the leader of suffering humanity for all time.

Reflections of a Pacifist After Eighteen Months in India

JAMES E. BRISTOL

On 30 January, the anniversary of Gandhi's death, I was invited to speak to the Gandhi Study Circle at the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi headquarters in New Delhi. I tried to look at the Indian scene today from the standpoint of a person who has been a pacifist and conscientious objector to war in the United States for the past twenty-five years, and who was, incidentally, imprisoned during the Second World War as a conscientious objector to military conscription. With that background and the bias it brings with it, I pointed out several significant ways in which the influence of Gandhi was very much alive in India today, thereby helping to strengthen and sharpen the contribution of this great peace-loving nation to the solution of the warring international problems of our day.

Towards the end of my remarks, however, I raised certain questions about ways in which the influence of Gandhi was possibly not as pronounced as it might be in today's India. I spoke of having witnessed the Republic Day parade on 26 January. This was still very vivid to me when I was speaking, and I expressed the shock and surprise as well as profound regret that I felt upon seeing such a formidable display of India's military might. I went on to ask whether followers of Gandhi in India, who on the whole applauded the efforts of American and British pacifists to protest against both the nuclear and conventional arms stock-piling of their own countries, should not make vigorous and outspoken protests against the armed preparedness of India. For example, should Indian believers in non-violence picket the Hindustan Aircraft factory to make a strong protest against the production

of military aircraft, just as Western pacifists picket nuclear testing areas and guided missile bases? Should they demonstrate before army camps and military bases in this country? This type of question I raised at the conclusion of my remarks.

These questions were reported the next day in the press, and within the next few days I received several suggestions that I enlarge upon these ideas for publication. The present article is the outcome.

Of necessity this article will be autobiographical in nature, and will express some of my thoughts and reactions after eighteen months in India, during which time I have been privileged to visit on numerous occasions people who were close to Gandhi and who continue to apply his spirit and example to the Indian scene. What has disturbed me (and I know other Western pacifists who have been similarly disturbed) is the fact that too few of these people voice the same vigorous criticism of the arms build-up of their own country which they articulate so eloquently as regards the armaments of the big powers. Certainly this is not always true, but after having engaged myself in many conversations and discussions with Gandhians, I feel that by far the most common attitude, not only of the Indian people generally, but also of the people who are working in the Gandhian tradition is (i) not to voice forthright opposition to the armed preparations of India in the face of an armed Pakistan, and (ii) to explain the situation in which India finds itself in such a way as to justify the arming of India. I should state here parenthetically that I fully realize how difficult the continuing American military aid to Pakistan makes the situation. I not only deplore U.S. aid to Pakistan but as an American citizen both in the United States and abroad I denounce this policy publicly, as well as all American military aid around the globe, and join in efforts through the years with both groups and individuals who seek to change that policy. However, although I deeply sympathize with the difficulties this military aid poses for India, two wrongs never make a right, and the U.S. aid to Pakistan does not basically alter the fact of the military response which it evokes from India.

American and British pacifists who visit India generally feel quite shocked at the above-mentioned two-fold attitude on the part of Indian believers in non-violence. In the West pacifists strongly and outspokenly oppose and work against the arming of their own country (and this was true long before the invention of nuclear weapons; since the first World War Western pacifists have taken exactly the same position against the conventional armaments of their own countries, and are still

opposed to conventional weapons today). Nor do Western pacifists defend and explain the position of their own country as 'necessitating' an armaments program. Instead they are highly critical of the policies of their government as contributing to the tensions and uncertainties which 'require' armed defense.

I recognize one perhaps subtle but powerful factor at work in India which at least partially serves to explain this difference between Western and Indian believers in non-violence. In the West, although we love our native land and feel our pacifism to be the expression of the highest form of patriotism, we have none the less never been associated in any great common cause with the present leaders of our government. Instead we have consistently through the years opposed the military policies which they in good conscience feel they must pursue, and have always been on the other side of the fence. In India, on the other hand, believers in non-violence have been associated in very recent times with the present leaders of the government as comrades, fellow-sufferers, and fellow-prisoners and in a non-violent independence movement, and they have together been fellow-followers of Gandhi. Therefore it becomes tremendously more difficult to oppose and criticize government policies here than in the West where such close bonds of friendship and comradeship do not exist.

It may indeed be that Western pacifists are at times so able to see the faults and shortcomings of their own government's position that they fail to understand sufficiently the justification for that position, even becoming at times more aware of the justification for the position of a hostile government than of their own. Although the superficial criticism that accuses American pacifists of being 'pro-Russian' or 'pro-Communist' is inaccurate, there may be at times a measure of truth in the accusation that the American pacifist understands the position of the Russian government and people almost better than he does that of his own. Thus American pacifists are able to point out quite tellingly how genuinely the Russians feel threatened by the encirclement of their homeland by American air bases. Many Indian believers in non-violence, however, seem so closely identified with the position of their own government and their own people that they go so far as to justify and defend the arms build-up in India, including the purchase of Canberra bombers, and the building of fighter planes in Bangalore. Nor are they able to see the situation through the eyes of the 'average Pakistani' and sense the theme which India's Army and Air Force pose for him.

Here it seems to me is the Achilles' heel in India's foreign policy.

Her 'defensive' armament in the face of a genuine threat from Pakistan undercuts in a decisive and extremely tragic way her efforts to ensure world peace and secure world disarmament. Even her attempts to bring an end to nuclear weapons tests are vitiated by her own arms build-up. It appears tragically true that India has essentially the same attitude in relation to a potential enemy that obtains in the United States and the Soviet Union. All nations and peoples are always sincerely peace-loving in their own eyes. They can see clearly the faults and shortcomings of other nations and the fact that in any other conflict situation than the one in which they are immediately involved both parties bear a share of the blame and guilt. In their own conflict, however, matters are always 'different'. In their own conflict they are always arming 'defensively'.

It may sound ridiculous to assert that United States military and air bases encircling the globe are 'defensive', yet they are honestly felt to be so by Americans generally. And once you realize the nature of the weapons with which a third world war would be fought and the terrifying speed with which the first move will be made in the extremely small world created by modern science, it is logical (if you accept the need for military preparedness) to regard these preparations as necessary in terms of 'defence'. It is important in this context to note that Pakistan feels genuinely threatened by India, and insists that India's armed strength is considerably greater than her own. The *Hindustan Times* of 6 April 1959 carried a news story with the headline reading: 'Pak Jet Fleet Will Be One-Third of India's'. The news dispatch went on to state that the American supply of 25 light jet bombers to Pakistan would give Pakistan a jet fleet one-third the size of that possessed by India. India had about eighty bombers of a similar type from Britain, the report said. I have no idea as to the authenticity of this statement, but it is important to realize how the situation looks from the other side of the fence.

What I would urge my Indian friends to recognize is that morally and in terms of basic attitudes there is no difference between threatening a potential enemy with a club, a Canberra bomber, or a hydrogen bomb. Obviously, the destructive effects are increasingly greater, and in the case of the hydrogen bomb even fallout from testing can harm innocent people thousands of miles away, but morally the position is the same. When you justify the acquisition of jet bombers, you have opened the gates for hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, and everything that spells ultimate and devastating tragedy for the human race. Understandably the so-called 'conventional' weapons look far less

destructive by comparison with ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons, but during the second World War the destruction of Rotterdam, of Coventry, of Warsaw, the obliteration bombing of German cities, and the devastation of Japanese cities, except for Hiroshima and Nagasaki, were all accomplished by what we now call 'conventional' weapons. The justification for India's conventional armaments build-up which even followers of Gandhi have voiced to me is therefore also a justification for the inhuman destruction of the second World War.

It should also be borne in mind that both the Soviet Union and the United States have largely discarded conventional weapons and are prepared now to 'defend themselves' almost entirely with nuclear weapons. To urge the nuclear disarmament of these nations (which I most emphatically do) is therefore in effect to reduce them to the same 'helpless' position militarily to which India would be reduced if she abandoned her conventional weapons. This realization may serve to underline the way in which India's insistence upon increasing her military strength undercuts so completely her efforts to assist in the achievement of nuclear disarmament among the big powers.

Very often in such discussions in India I have been reminded that Gandhi himself stated that it was a higher moral position to resist evil with violence than to be a coward and surrender to evil forces. When Martin Luther King, American Negro leader of the non-violent movement against racial segregation, at his final press conference in Delhi on 9 March suggested that India take the lead in efforts towards disarmament, if necessary setting the example by disarming unilaterally herself, the newspaper reporters reminded him of Gandhi's emphasis, extolling courageous though violent resistance rather than cowardice. No-one could disagree with the truth of this Gandhian insight, but it does pose a terrifying dilemma, especially in the age of jet bombers, guided missiles, and nuclear weapons. Often, I believe, we think of these words of Gandhi in terms of hand-to-hand fighting in the streets, or even in terms of guerrilla warfare. We think of the underground which operates for freedom in totalitarian countries and in the colonial areas of the world, and even if we were deeply dedicated to non-violence and are conscientious objectors to war ourselves, we admire the courage of the violent resisters and clearly regard them as infinitely more moral than the cowards. Once, however, you accept the principle and apply it all the way you have really given moral sanction to the staggering brutality and destruction of the second World War and to the possible obliteration of mankind in a nuclear war. India must resist the evil in Pakistan with Canberra bombers and

similar preparations (and it is always implicit in military preparedness that the weapons being amassed will be used if necessary), and both the United States and the Soviet Union must resist the evil which each sees in the other with nuclear warfare preparation—and with the use of these weapons if necessary. Thus the dilemma becomes more and more difficult with every moment of increasing military preparation whether in America or Europe or Asia.

Certainly the alternative to today's mass-organized, 'defensive' violence is not to surrender to tyranny and injustice and oppression, but to hasten the day when effective non-violent resistance to evil can be offered. This lays heavily upon all believers in non-violence the urgent necessity of creating a *Śānta Senā*, as Vinobā Bhave and others are steadfastly striving to do, which will be large enough and disciplined enough to offer effective resistance, even to an invading army. It also underlines the urgency of creating a *Sarvodaya* society, one based on justice, mutual service, and freedom and equality for all, which will produce peace and harmony as inevitably as our present social order produces distrust and tension and the crises that lead to war.

The question which is perhaps as old as the human race, of course, persists: What do we do in the meantime? One thing it seems to me we do not do is to support or justify the military preparations of our own nation—be it America or England or Russia or India. We do not wait for the achievement of the *Śānta Senā* or the realisation of the *Sarvodaya* society before opposing vigorously the military preparedness of our own nation, for while we are waiting the military mind and the reliance upon military measures for security are being held upon an increasing number of our fellow citizens. It is already far more difficult for the world to disarm now than it was ten years ago. It will be even harder five or ten years from now than it is today.

Therefore, we must keep alive our protests and make our opposition to the military preparedness of our own country vocal and vigorous, working at the same time for the achievement of the *Śānta Senā* and the *Sarvodaya* society, which will be that much easier to achieve to the extent that our country is less committed to a policy of military defence. If an enemy invades or a hostile nation strikes before we have achieved our goals, then we still remain small pockets of people committed completely to non-violent opposition to all forms of evil and tyranny. We resist the evil within our own nation. We resist the evil in the invading army. We resist the evil of a hostile

and oppressive regime fastened upon us. Moreover, this we do realising that our resistance may not prove effective in the immediate sense and that we and our families may suffer imprisonment, torture, or even death. Thus we do undaunted by the faith that no action of this sort is ever entirely lost in the long stream of history, and that the world moves on a bit faster towards a just and free and decent society because of those who try to hold as close to the ideal as possible.

+

After completing the rough draft of this article I was privileged to talk with Vinobā Bhāve near Rājpur at the end of April. Since I was asked to write out my questions for Vinobā, I have an exact record of one question I put to him: 'Gandhī has said that it is better to resist evil with violence than to be a coward. This can become the justification for nuclear war. How can we deal with this dilemma when our countrymen are not prepared to use non-violent resistance to evil?'

Vinobā replied that we have to weigh this one statement of Gandhī's over against the total impact of his entire life. Gandhī made this statement only once and he never repeated it. Vinobā then went on to note that Islam began as a religion of peace (Islam means 'peace'), but at one particular period the adherents of the faith were fleeing under persecution and Mohammed then counselled them that it was better to fight than to be cowards. This one injunction was later followed so thoroughly that when the first Islamic state was established it had an army. There has been a subsequent distortion of emphasis in Islam ever since.

So it was, Vinobā felt, with this one statement of Gandhī's. Over-emphasis upon it has led to a distortion of Gandhī's thinking. Vinobā went on to say that war today had become insane; it was mass murder; there could be no justification for it. I interpreted to mention the many times that people in India, including Gandhians, have cited these words of Gandhī to me. I stated that they have been quoted to me more often in India than in any other part of the world. 'Yes', Vinobā replied, 'they have become a Gospel proof text'.

Nehru Remembers G a n d h i

When I was invited to come here¹ I gladly agreed, and yet I always find some difficulty in accepting an engagement of this kind relating to Gandhi, because his memory and the thought of him fill my mind often in many ways and sometimes also confuses it. It is not perhaps the thought of Gandhi that confuses my mind, but I am always trying to find out how he might have reacted to situations, what he would have advised and how far we have fallen away from that possible advice of his. That troubles me and it might trouble others. I cannot, of course, presume to imagine that I can set up to the high standards that he would have liked and that he had laid down. Nevertheless, this thought comes to me often: Are we of this present generation, not merely acting up or not acting up, but are we essentially true to what we say about him in so many words or do we say something which is essentially not true, in the sense that it becomes a thing of words and we do not set up to it? It is a very difficult question and a difficult problem. And because it is difficult I do not know what to tell others about it when I cannot solve it for myself.

But I remember then, that Gandhi was of course something much bigger than all we had imagined of him, that he had this remarkable quality of allowing and even encouraging those who were privileged to follow him to think out their problems for themselves—with his guidance to them, of course—but to come to their own decisions and to act more according to their own light, even though that light might be

1. Transcript of his address at the opening of the Gandhi Memorial Museum, Madurai, and the inauguration of the Conference of Chairmen and Secretaries of State Boards of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi, on 23 April 1958.

dam. He did not want to impose himself on any one. He certainly wanted to win the minds and hearts of people to his own way, which was not that of imposition. He did not want people to suppress and compress themselves and blindly say or do what he said. That was not the kind of following he wanted, though inevitably, under the stress of his great personality, people did find it difficult to function quite independently in mind. That is inevitable and it cannot be helped if you come in contact with a person like that. Still he did not encourage it. And so when problems come, it becomes our duty, I imagine, to come to our own decisions about them, keeping in view, of course, whatever we have learnt from him, but to come to our own decisions and not take shelter in some things that he might have said under different circumstances on a different occasion.

It is difficult to say what he would do or say in a different set of circumstances, because Gāndhījī was essentially a dynamic person. He was not a person who went by some kind of rote and said the same thing in changing situations. He certainly had his feet firmly planted on certain principles and tried his utmost and, I believe, succeeded to the full in the journey which he had set for himself—nothing could move him from that once it was clear in his mind. But he did not consider every minor aspect of life as some basic truth which could not be changed. He had realised that life is a changing and developing phenomenon and therefore has to be met in a developing and dynamic way. In the half century and more of his tremendous service to India and to humanity, he himself developed, he himself knew problems and met new problems in a new way or a somewhat changed way, because he had that quality in him of seeing change and meeting it and yet keeping true to his basic ideals. How can we, as we are, talk of him and try to imagine that we are living up to his ideals. That is what troubles me.

One would like to talk about him, of course, because even to talk about him is a consolation, and a reminder of something big. It lifts us. Even to come to a place like this Museum is good. It lifts us out of ourselves and takes us into some region which is above the petty conflicts and hatreds of our lives. So it is good to come here and it is good that we are having such Museums in various parts of India. It is good sometimes even to have some kind of a statue of Gāndhījī, in stone, marble or bronze. For many years I cracked strongly against images and statues being put up, partly because I disliked worship of images of any kind and its taking the place of the inner quality that an individual should have in his worship or thinking. I felt we are too apt to perform formal functions and think that our duty is over. But on later consideration I felt

that I was not right in objecting to a statue or something like it being put up, provided that it is good as a work of art. I thought it is desirable because after all it would be a reminder. It would bring back to us, and to those who see it, the memory, vivid or faint, of a mighty person, a mighty son of India, and that memory would perhaps make us better for a little while. So I welcome the statue put up here, which is a good one.

It is good to think of him because, I think, the mere thought of him does us good and it makes us question ourselves, even as his living presence made us question ourselves. For when we saw him it was a joy and a pleasure, but now there is a slight pain and doubt whether we have lived up to him whose name we take so often. And so while we rejoiced to be near him, we were also slightly tortured in spirit by this eternal question as to whether we were worthy of him, whether we were not perhaps saying something and appearing to be something which we were not. If that were so in his living presence, how much more must it be when he is not with us. So the memory of him always brings this eternal question. And, then, naturally we cannot live our lives in little questioning. We have to decide, we have to act in the living present, and we have ultimately to act according to our own light.

There is another aspect of it: sometimes not acting entirely even according to our light. That is where another great difficulty comes in. Gandhiji was a prophetic figure, a great leader and yet entirely different from the political leaders that one normally sees, however big they may be. And because we stuck to his message, whatever be the consequences, we would face those consequences rather than compromise with what we consider to be the right thing. But the so-called political leaders—and I am not using the word 'political' in a bad sense; I am referring to the good leaders, call them statesmen, politicians, leaders of the people, what you like—have always to deal with the people they are supposed to lead and they can only lead them as far as they can go. The leader might see the truth—I am using the word in a rather narrow sense—but unless those whom he leads also see it, what is he to do? If he cannot lead them far and simply goes ahead by himself, that would be wrong. If he is to keep pace with them, to some extent he has to limit that truth or the action following his perception of the truth, because the others have not perceived it adequately or enough. And so he is always troubled with this problem of what is essentially a compromise between things that ought to be done and what he feels can be done under limiting circumstances. And, of course, in a sense Gandhiji was not only a man of high principles and a devoted follower of truth

but very much in touch with the pulse of the people. In fact if anybody could represent the people of India essentially, it was he. He knew the people thoroughly and he was part of them, much more so than many of us. The miracles he asked them to perform, he thought they could perform, and they did perform. I believe that he did not ask them to do something which was entirely impossible of achievement. He might ask an individual for a stricter discipline, but not the people as a whole. Nevertheless, he never compromised with what he considered wrong; and there is no political leader in all this wide world, however great he may be, who does not have to compromise from day to day. Such compromise may be in respect of small matters. But if you get into the habit of compromising in small matters, sometimes you may do it in big matters too; it is a slippery process. For essentially, and oddly enough, in a democratic society it becomes even more necessary to compromise, because a democratic leader not only leads but is also led. I mention this to you because of the constant struggle that has to be faced by many of us. It is difficult enough to face the world's problem, or our country's problems. Today they are difficult and exciting problems; they present a challenge to the manhood in us; and yet apart from their inherent difficulty there is this other difficulty of trying to fit them into what Gandhiji had said or done in a different context. I am not referring to the scores and hundreds of things that he said on this occasion or that, although whatever he said formed more or less a perfect picture, because his life was essentially a work of art with no false line or false tune in it. He was a great leader who was, at a given moment, meeting a particular problem of the time, which may not have that big significance in later days and later ages. There was something about his life which had that permanent significance which maybe the eternal truth has.

Now, some of us sometimes attach ourselves to some of the things that Gandhiji said or did, important as they were, but perhaps in my opinion not so important as some of the other things he said. There is always a danger of the follower losing himself in trivial details and forgetting the major lessons of the teacher. That is inevitable; because the follower is limited by his own understanding and, being rather overawed by the greatness of the teacher, will be unable to get out of the many smaller things to see the bigger things.

But essentially here it is: that a man of God walked on the soil of India and sanctified it by his penance. He sanctified not only the soil of India but changed the minds and hearts of our people; not so much of those who thought themselves very clever but of the humble

and the disheartened and the dispossessed. And his picture therefore is the right picture. To the humble people of India, it is the picture of a great person thinking of them, working for them and putting some hope and joy in their lives.

It is good that we remember that picture above all else and remember also his fundamentals; that means are more important than ends and that no ends are right or tend to be absolutely right if we try to achieve them by wrong means and wrong weapons. Now I am repeating something as if by rote; and yet it has become frightfully difficult to apply these things in our lives in many little matters. It is very seldom that we have to choose between black and white. There are so many intervening shades of grey in our lives. Nevertheless, it is good to keep that principle in mind. It will keep us from slipping and falling.

So I have come here today to offer my homage afresh to him and to his memory. You Chairmen and Secretaries and others who have gathered here and who will meet in conference for some days at Gāndhī-gāim will discuss many aspects of your work. Perhaps these deeper problems do trouble you also. It is well that they do. Even as you concentrate on the work you have and go to the villages, keep this larger perspective before you.

I should like to give my tribute to the Chairman and the Secretary of the Gāndhī Smārak Nidhi, who have done good work and made the Nidhi blossom forth all over India. I hope this work will not merely take the form of symbols, like the Museum—however good they may be—but achieves something deeper and greater.

Some Letters from Gandhi to Tagore : 1932-1935¹

Laburnum Road,
Bombay,
3 January 1932.

Dear Gurudev,

I am just stretching my tired limbs on the mattress and as I try to steal a wink of sleep I think of you. I want you to give your best to the superficial fire that is being lighted.²

With love,
M.K. Gandhi.

Yeravdi Central Prison,
20 September 1932

Dear Gurudev,

This is early morning three o'clock of Tuesday. I enter the fiery gate of noon.³ If you can bless the effort, I want it. You have been to me a true friend because you have been a candid friend often speaking your thoughts aloud. I looked forward to a firm opinion from you one way or the other. But you have refused to criticise. Through it can now only be during my fast, I will yet prize your criticism, if your heart condemns my action. I am not too proud to make an open confession

1. These letters, reproduced from photographs in our possession, belong to one of the stormiest periods of Gandhi's leadership of the national struggle. They show how in moments of great stress and strain Gandhi thought of Tagore.

2. This was written some days after his return from the Round Table Conference in London. A few hours after he wrote that he was arrested and taken to Yeravdi Central Prison, from where most of the following letters are addressed.

3. The reference is to the hour when he was to begin his 'fast unto death', about which he wrote: "The first which I am approaching was retained upon in the name of God, for His work and, as I believe in all humility, in His call . . . It is not open to me to change even the hour . . .".

of my blunder, whatever the cost of the confusion, if I find myself in error. If your heart approves of the action, I want your blessing. It will sustain me. I hope I have made myself clear.

My love,
M.K. Gandhi.

10.30 a.m.

Just as I was handing this to the superintendent, I got your loving and magnificent wire.⁴ It will sustain me in the midst of the storm I am about to enter. I am sending you a wire.

Thank you.

M.K.G.

Yeravdi Central Prison,
9 October 1932.

Dear Gurudev,

I have your beautiful letter. I am daily seeking light. This unity between Hindus and Muslims is also [my] life's mission. The restrictions too hamper me. But I know that when I have the light, it will pierce through the restrictions. Meanwhile I pray, though I do not yet feel.

I hope you were none the worse for the strenuous work in Poona and the equally fatiguing long journey. Mahadev translated for us your beautiful sermon to the villagers on the twentieth ultimo.

With love,

Yours,
M.K. Gandhi

Yeravdi Central Prison,
10 November 1932.

Dear Gurudev,

You must have seen the statement I have circulated to the Press. I want your blessings, if I can have them, for this further effort. I do not know whether you feel that this effort is, if possible, purer than before. The last fast had a political tinge about it and superficial critics were able to say that it was aimed at the British Government. This time, if the ordeal has to come, it will not be possible to give any political colour to it. You will, of course, recall that the last fast was broken on

4. The telegram read: "It is worth sacrificing precious life for the sake of India's unity and her moral integrity. Our sorrowing hearts will follow your sublime penance with reverence and love."

the clearest possible notice that I might have to resign if there was any breach of faith by the so-called caste Hindus. The prospective deal about the Gurukulāgur temple is absolutely a point of honour. It is being made by the orthodox section the centre of attack and is being given an all-India significance. I rather like it. But it makes it all the more necessary for the liberalising influences to be collected together and set in order to overthrow the monster of untouchability. I want your whole-hearted cooperation, if you feel as I do.

I hope you are keeping well.

With deep love,

Yours,
M.K. Gandhi.

Yeravdi Central Prison,
24 November 1932.

Dear Gurudev,

Your precious letter comforts me. It is enough for me that you are watching and weeping.

With deep love,

Yours,
M.K. Gandhi

Yeravdi Mandir¹,
25 February 1933.

Dear Gurudev,

At the instance of Śrī Ghanashyāmdās² you sent a poem³ for the *Harjān*, of which I hope you received the first issue. *Harjān* are your special care. I am therefore not going to be satisfied with that message only. If you can send something occasionally it will be a source of strength to me personally and a help to the readers of *Harjān* in the midst of so much that is going on to undermine their faith.

I hope you are keeping well.

With love from us all,

Yours,
M.K. Gandhi.

1. Gandhi's nickname for the Yeravdi Central Prison, in which he was now in confinement for well over a year.

2. Śrī G. D. Bhatt.

3. The poem, entitled 'The Chatterer', was published in the first issue of *Harjān*, which came out on 11 February 1933 from Poona. Gandhi received the poem from press.

Yeravdi Central Prison,

2 May 1933.

Dear Gurushev,

It is just now 1.45 a.m. and I think of you and some other friends. If your heart endorses (my) contemplated fast,¹ I want your blessings again.

My love and respects.

Yours,
M.K. Gandhi

Ahmedabad,
27 July 1933.

Dear Gurushev,

I have read your press message regarding the Yeravdi Fast, in so far as it applies to Bengal. It caused me deep grief to find that you were misled, by very deep affection for me and by your confidence in my judgement, into approving of a Fast which was discovered to have done a grave injustice to Bengal. It is now no use my saying that affection for me should not have affected your judgement, or that confidence in my judgement ought not to have made you accept a Fast about which you had ample means for coming to an independent judgement. Knowing as I do your very generous nature, you could not have acted otherwise than you did, and in spite of the discovery made by you that you have committed a grave error you would continue to repeat such errors if the occasions too were repeated.

I am not at all convinced that there was any error made. As soon as the agitation for an amendment of the Fact arose I applied my mind to it, discussed it with friends who ought to know, and I was satisfied that there was no injustice done to Bengal. I corresponded with those who complained of injustice. But they too, including Ramkrishn Bhow, could not convince me of any injustice. Of course, our points of view were different. In my opinion, the approach to the question was also wrong.

A Fast arrived at by mutual arrangement cannot possibly be altered by the British Government except through the consent of the parties to the Fast. But no serious attempt seems to have been made to secure

¹ The 12-day fast undertaken by him for the same cause as the previous one—the removal of ‘untouchability’. Tagore had misgivings about this fast, but he admitted: ‘My misgivings may be the outcome of a timidity of temperament’. Soon after the fast began Gandhi was released from prison, and the fast was continued in Porbandar, Lady Thackersey’s residence in Poona.

any such agreement. Your appearance, therefore, on the same platform as the complainers I, for one, welcome, in the hope that it would lead to mutual discussion, instead of a futile appeal to the British Government. If, therefore, you have, for your own part, studied the subject and have arrived at the opinion that you have now pronounced, I would like you to convene a meeting of the principal parties and convince them that a grave injustice has been done to Bengal. If it can be proved, I have no doubt that the Fact will be re-considered and amended so as to undo the wrong said to have been done to Bengal. If I felt convinced that there was an error of judgment, so far as Bengal was concerned, I would strain every nerve to see that the error was rectified. You may know that up to now I have studiously refrained from saying anything in public, in defence of the Fact, save by way of registering my opinion, accompanied by the statement that if injustice could be proved, redress would be given. I am, therefore, entirely at your service.

Just now I am absorbed in disbanding the *Ahimsa*⁹ and devising means of saving as much as can be for public use. My service will, therefore, be available after I am imprisoned, which event may take place any day after the end of this month.¹⁰ I hope you are keeping good health.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Yaravdi Central Prison,
7 August 1933.

Dear Ganadev,

Your letter of 28 July, enclosing copy of your cable to Sir Nagesh Sarkar¹¹ on the Yaravdi Fact, was handed to me here on the fourth instant. Evidently your letter crossed mine, which I wrote whilst I was in Ahmedabad. For the time being I am unable, however, to send you anything but this bare acknowledgement.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

9. The *Sikarami Ahimsa*.

10. He was arrested on 1 August, released on the fourth and re-arrested, which explains why the following letter is again addressed from the Yaravdi Central Prison.

11. Sir Nageshramdas Sarkar, a member of the Viceroy's Council.

21 January 1934

Dear Gurudev,

The news about the Government measures in Midnapur has dashed me. They appear to me to be worse than the martial law measures of the Pargah in 1919. I get here only the *News*. Are you doing anything? Is Bengal doing anything? Our cowardice chokes me. Or do I see cowardice where there is none? Can you give me any solace?

I hope you are keeping well.

With deep love,

Ever yours,
M.K. Gandhi.

I am in Coonoor¹³ between 29 January and 5 February

29 February 1934

Dear Gurudev,

I received your letter only just now. There is a campaign of vilification of me going on. My remarks on the Bihar calamity¹⁴ were a good handle to beat me with. I have spoken about it at many meetings. Enclosed is my considered opinion.¹⁵ I see from your statement that we have come upon perhaps a fundamental difference. But I cannot help myself. I do believe that super-physical consequences flow from physical events. How they do so, I do not know.

If, after reading my article, you still see the necessity of publishing your statement, it can be at once published either here or there, just as you desire. I hope you are keeping well.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

The last lines are disgracefully written out. I was tired out and half asleep. Please forgive. If I am to catch the post today, I may not want to make a fair copy.

13 In the course of his whitened 'Harijan Trav' of the country.

14 The Bihar earthquake of 19 January 1934, which Gandhi believed to be a divine chastisement for the continuing practice of 'untouchability' in India. 'It is an amazing thing for me', he wrote in *Navin* (2 February 1934) to guess that the Bihar calamity is due to the sin of untouchability. It makes me humble, it spurs me to greater effort towards its removal.

15 Probably a copy of his article in *Navin* (18 February 1934) which he wrote in reply to Tagore's statement referred to in the first sentence. In that statement Tagore had said: 'As for us, we feel perfectly secure in the faith that our men and women, however numerous, have not enough force to drag down the structure of creation to ruin'.

Wardha,
10 November 1934. 151

Dear Gurudev,

The All-India Village Industries Association, which is being formed under the auspices of the Indian National Congress, will need the assistance of expert advisers in the various matters that will engage its attention. It is not intended to trouble them to meet together or even the members of the Association, but merely to advise the Association whenever reference is made to them in matters in which they possess special knowledge, e.g., in chemical analysis, food values, sanitation, distribution of village industries, co-operation, disposal of village waste as manure, methods of village transport, education (adult and other) care of infants, and many other things too numerous to mention here.

Will you please allow your name to appear among such advisers of the All-India Village Industries Association? Naturally I approach you in the belief that the object of the Association and the method of approach to its task have your approval.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Wardha,
13 October 1935.

Dear Gurudev,

Your touching letter was received only on the eleventh instant when I was in the midst of meetings. In the hope of delivering it to me personally, Anil needlessly detained it. I hope he is now quite restored to health.

Yes, I have the financial position before me now. You may depend upon my straining every nerve to find the required money. I am groping. I am trying to find the way out. It will take some time before I can report the result of my search to you.

It is unthinkable that you should have to undertake another haggard mission at your age. The necessary funds must come to you without your having to stir out of Śriniketan.

I hope you are keeping well. Padmaji, who was with you a few days ago, is here for the day and has been telling me how you have aged.

With reverential love,

Yours,
M.K. Gandhi.

The Map of Mrs Brown

REGINALD REYNOLDS

I do not remember any time in my life when I have felt so powerless or so intellectually isolated. I am writing this article to clear my own mind and to discover, from its reception, whether my sense of isolation is an illusion.

It is not that I am a defeatist. The more sterile my own thinking becomes, the stronger is my conviction that the solution of our major problem—the abolition of war—is so obvious that I cannot see it.

As a Quaker I seek peace by the ways of peace. But the world crisis is, for me, a personal crisis of utter frustration. One curious thing is that if the world crisis became a personal crisis for everyone it would cease to exist; for one aspect of the problem is that the state of society is critical just because most individuals are indifferent to it. Even to disseminate anxiety ought therefore to be of some value. One circle of causation in which I am caught is due to the fact that I am frustrated because I cannot share my frustration.

Many of my friends and colleagues have programs. I divide them into three groups. Group One is the Pacifist Old Guard. They are good old sloggers who cling honestly to the belief that the elegance and activities which have been proved and tested by decades of dismal failure deserve our allegiance and will at any moment lead on to victory. Group Two I call the Perfectionists. They say many things with which I agree about war and society; and having proved that there can be no peace without a complete social, political, economic, psychological and spiritual revolution, they nevertheless leave me with an awkward feeling that they are talking very good sense about town planning when the immediate and urgent necessity is a fire engine, which they reject as a palliative. Group Three are acutely conscious of time. They have a sense of urgency, which I share with them, and believe that if people can be induced to

take one step towards peace they may see the sense of taking a second and a third. In this, too, I find excellent sense. But I find in Group Three a passion for action which is not directed by any real understanding of what they are up against.

And that leaves me, and I suspect some others, not very happy about any of these groups, but without any constructive suggestions of my own. It also leaves the vast majority of mankind (quite uninterested in any of their would-be answers) shambling like zombies to destruction.

+

Gandhi had the best qualities of Group Two and Group Three. A perfectionist in his own life and in his ultimate ideals, he knew that his task was to inspire and lead ordinary people on to one limited objective after another until they grew to a greater perception of human destiny. He called himself a Practical Idealist.

He could, like an Old Testament Prophet, try to convert an individual ruler—such as Sennacherib or Irgun. But he also knew that Prime Ministers and Viceroys were not (like Old Testament Kings) free agents. While those whom they represented remained unconverted, rulers could be replaced as easily as the human tools they used for repression: the soldier, the policeman, the prison warden and the executioner.

No campaign against capital punishment would make much progress if its main activity was to pocket prisons and seek to convert the hangman. When a hanging takes place the whole of acquiescent society is the executioner; and, while society continues to approve, someone will always be found to do the work. I have seen it stated that it would be worth while to persuade even one single worker at Aldermaston to give up the work of death—the construction of nuclear weapons. That is true. It would be even better to persuade one single hangman to give up hanging. It would represent a very high percentage of the profession, which is very limited in numbers, and it would have a more spectacular effect—perhaps even a deeper one—on the mind of his employers: the public.

But such a success would not touch the centre of the problem. It would have, at best, only a peripheral effect on the mind of Society. Also I have a growing conviction that it is Society, rather than its employees in the work of death, which could—if we knew how—be enlightened,

stirred up to emotional reaction and convinced. The executioner knows his job better than I do. If his work does not cause revolution, why should my description of it do so? It is Society which needs to face the reality which the hangman has faced—and accepted. Society, one hopes, if it really faced it, would reject it. And in a very similar way I find that I have little to say to those who make our lethal weapons for us. What could I hope to tell Sir William Perrey that he does not already know, much better than I do, and apparently accepts? But Mrs Brown, who votes for John Smith, M.P., who supports nuclear weapons in Parliament, is not—I suspect—so well informed as Sir William. She either cannot or will not accept things which seem very plain to me. So long as Mrs Brown and Mr Smith actively or passively accept the politics of universal suicide, there will always be somebody to do Sir William's job.

+

It is the mind of Mrs Brown which worries me. I think about her almost continually and I get no nearer to understanding her. She is not, I find, a very aggressive person. But when she thinks about war at all which seems to be very seldom—she appears to be quite incapable of visualising what it would mean to herself or to anybody else. If you argue with her you meet a mass of mutually inconsistent irrelevances. Some of my friends patiently try to discuss things with her, and I am not impressed by the results. Others try to frighten her, and they fare even worse.

The shadow of the hangman once more provides a startling analogy. In the days when hundreds of men, women and children in Britain were still hanged every year for small thefts, under savage laws, that great penal reformer, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, asked himself how this was possible. Why did not the fear of such a frightful penalty deter people from petty theft? Could it really be worth while to achieve so small a gain at such a terrible risk?

The answer which Wakefield found was that the penalty was so great that it was beyond the average person's power to imagine it. Or alternatively, that he shut his mind to it. He pointed to the fact that for hundreds of years people had believed in Hell Fire, but that this belief had made little difference to human behaviour, because an eternity of Hell Fire was impossible to imagine and easily 'shut out' from one's calculations. In exactly the same way the reality of nuclear war is too great to be imagined and easily excluded by unconscious mechanisms of

the mind. And this brings me to a startling conclusion, though it provides only the tentative beginning of a realistic programme.

+

It is stupid to try to frighten Mrs Brown, because her imagination refuses to comprehend your modern brand of Hell Fire. And it is foolish to argue with Mrs Brown, because she is not rational in her objections to your case. She is merely 'rationalising' what she wants to believe; and if you drive her out of one bogus line of defence, with tremendous effort, she will take refuge in another. What you and I need is to find out much more about Mrs Brown. We need to discover where the 'blockage' is, and give some thought to removing it.

If you and I were conducting a big business, producing an excellent commodity in which we had complete confidence, and if nobody would buy it, would we spend our time in forms of advertisement which had been proved to have no effect on our potential customers? Would we instruct our salesmen to argue the logical case for buying what we had to sell, once it had been demonstrated that logic cut no ice at all? We would not. We should engage a team of motivation research merchants to find out what was the real, emotional 'blockage' and then we should set to work to get past that 'blockage'.

So my program for Mrs Brown—and Mr Brown and all their relatives—is that we should begin with a survey. What we need is a few social psychologists, willing to give some time as instructors to a team of men and women who would set out under the instructions of the social psychologists on a fact-finding mission. The results of their field researches would then be studied by the psychologists, and out of their findings we might hope to discover the art of making Mrs Brown 'vulnerable'.

I cannot anticipate these findings. If I could, the research I propose would be unnecessary. But I will make a guess now that if a way is found it will be through some form of emotional release which will enable Mrs Brown to *live* the truth of things which at present are only intellectual abstractions and therefore practically meaningless to her.

Group Three are in a hurry. So am I. But I see no point in hurrying up another *ad hoc* sac. The quickest way to hurry in a country unknown to you is to consult the map first. Unfortunately, however, the map of Mrs Brown has yet to be made. There is no time to lose.

Gandhi in Kannada Literature

M. YAMUNACHARYA

The beginnings of the twentieth century in Kannada literature felt the dynamic personality of Gandhi. In 1919, when the non-cooperation movement was launched by Gandhi, pamphlets and leaflets on him and his work were being written and circulated in Kannada. The literature that appeared in the wake of that movement put on a new hue. Gandhi's writings came to be avidly read. It was an exciting experience to read his articles as they appeared week after week in his journals.

One of the earliest Kannada writers on Gandhian thought is D. K. Bhavadvdy, an Ayurvedic physician of Bangalore who is now no more. Among other early writers on Gandhi is NRIitar Śrinivāsa Rāu, now one of the judges of the High Court of Mysore, who brought out a Kannada translation of Gandhi's autobiography, along with other smaller books relating to Gandhian thought.

In Siddavannahalli Krṣṇa Saṁsā we have a celebrated writer whose style in Kannada is remarkably close to Gandhi's style of writing. He has done much spadework in disseminating Gandhian ideas in Kannada and has written numerous works, including his translation of some of the important works of Gandhi and his minutely lucid exposition of Gandhi's thoughts which he published through his Gandhi Sahitya Saṁgha, Bangalore. In one of his books he has given a delightful account of his visit to Wardha. A significant passage in that book strikes the keynote of the fascination that Gandhi exercised on Kannada writers. 'Gandhi is like a wizard in the world of men. No-one could escape his fascination. None could escape being subdued by the snake-charmer's flute. None who met him could leave without being

profoundly affected in mind and heart. Many a pilgrim has staked his throat in this sacred lake of him. The name Gāndhī stands for all that is pure and noble.'

It was in the 'thirties that books on Gāndhī and his thought began to appear in abundance. The 'thirties, indeed, marked the new Gāndhian era in Kannada literature. Some of the leading poets of Karnataka felt the surging wave of Gāndhism and wrote poems expressive of their own emotional reaction to the personality of Gāndhī and his new message to India and the world. Every news of Gāndhī's suffering and sacrifice sent a wave of holy anguish through the people and those endowed with the gift of utterance invoked the aid of the muses to turn the theme into poetry.

R.R. Devikar, the doyen of Gāndhian writers in Kannada, wrote thus in a preface to a collection of poems on Gāndhī: 'This is a small collection of poems. They were gathered with love. Like lotuses blossoming with the rise of the sun the hearts of poets blossom with the advent of great souls and shed their poetic fragrance. On all the languages of India the greatness of the Mahātmā has shed its glory.'

Gowda Pu, the poet laureate of Karnataka, sang thus in his poem entitled *You Should Have Lived Yet* :

You should have lived yet—
India needs you now,
Without you she is like a storm-tossed ship.
Who but you can steer her safe to the haven ?

When Gāndhī came to Mysore in 1933-34, on his tour for the collection of funds for the Harijan cause, the popular poet of Karnataka, K.V. Putappa, the present Vice-Chancellor of the University of Mysore, wrote a poem on him entitled *The Angel of Goodness* :

The yearning for ascent to the Divine is still a living flame. It grows brighter with every dawn. Gāndhī is the living witness of this great aspiration. He stands and speaks in the blazing sun, millions crowd around to listen to him and do homage to him. They love to offer to this noblest among men the gifts they have. Men gather like bees to taste his words sweet as honey. No regal glory envelopes him, he works no miracles. His speech is not adorned—he straightaway speaks of human affection, the passion for truth, the sense of the brotherhood of man. He moves men with his gospel of a divinely simple life.

In *Saty-Darshan*, a symposium got together on the occasion of Gandhi's eightieth birthday, he wrote: 'Gandhi is now no more. His earthly pilgrimage has come to an end. His life is today like a finished picture. We may now look at it as a whole. We may turn it this way and that and look at it standing wherever we like, spot-lighting it at will. It is perhaps true for me to say that we are now in a better position to look at him with detachment, so soon after his death. With the lapse of time he is sure to come nearer to us.'

Dattatraya Ramesandra Bendre of Dhārwar, a poet of rare distinction in Kannada, was profoundly influenced by Gandhi and his teachings. Bendre is a poet-myth. In a book of poems called *Śrī-yajñar* (Vajrage of the Sun), the poet speaks of the shocking event of Gandhi's death thus: 'Whose is this whose life has been extinguished by a fall hand? He is a messenger of peace, the great hero, the child of God. He fell with the holy name of Rama on his lips. The words came out of a torn heart.' The poet recalls the names of Gandhi's predecessors who had laid down their lives for the truth—Socrates and Jesus: 'A cup of hemlock was given to Socrates and Jesus was crucified. Both stood a judicial trial. But Gandhi was finished off by a fool. He did not realise that disembodied Gandhi was more powerful than the embodied one.' Love and sacrifice were the watchwords of Gandhi. He cried with arms uplifted to the peoples of the world: Live in love, and you will endure. He taught us the 'heights of life', says the poet.

On the eve of Gandhi's death the poet sheds a tear of love for the Mahatma and exclaims: 'The candle of Gandhi has consumed itself but the living flame remains. Light your own candles with it and be witnesses to the living flame.' 'Do not say that oil in the lamp is finished, pour the oil of friendliness and keep the flame alight.' Here the poet puts on the word '*mela*' which means both 'oil' and 'friendship'.

Bendre wrote another poem on Gandhi which he called 'Deathless Death' (*Asare-Maraga*). In this poem he spoke of Gandhi as the *mukta*, the liberated one whose life-breath was to restore God's existence everywhere. He describes Gandhi as 'a hero who stood up in defiance of pain, an unarmed hero, a happy warrior of peace, a fearless and courteous soul, an adept at living'. The poet wonders, 'Could he be a mere man?'

In another of his poems, Bendre paints a word-picture of Gandhi walking on the ground with his feet so lightly placed as not to injure the earth. This is the picture of his famous Dandi march, which the

poet says was intended to put some salt into our dry bones. He thus became literally 'the salt of the earth'. Elsewhere in a charming poem, which also has Gandhi as its theme, Bender says: 'His life is a work of art. It is a tune played on the *veed* of peace'. He addresses Gandhi thus: 'The memory of your form, your sea-like eyes, stirs up sublime thoughts which will issue in excellent deeds'. In another poem which has for its refrain 'Victory, victory to thee, O Gandhi the charmer' he says: 'The theme of thy poem of life has evoked a tune in me. Kindness and *ahimsa* are thy refrain.'

D V. Gundappa, a well-known publicist and man of letters, wrote a poem in which he referred to Gandhi as a 'self-perfected soul' and a 'guide to a life of spiritual riches'. 'Srinivasa' (a pen-name of M. Sri Venkatesa Ayyangar, the poet, playwright, short-story writer and columnist who edits a journal in Kannada called *Samam*) wrote a poem entitled *The Fusion of Gandhi* in which he described him as 'the kinsman of the whole world'. 'Is he a moving light crystallized or a mere body of flesh and blood?' he asks. G.K. Heggade writes: 'By the single incarnation of this immortal Mahatma, one thousand faces of truth have blossomed'. Gangadhar Citala wrote, in a poem on the passing away of Gandhi: 'When thy blood was spilt on the earth, the earth trembled and the flowers of the day faded. Oh, the humanity of man to man. The best of men are slaughtered at the stake of life.' D S Kirki described Gandhi as 'one who moved away from us and walked into the distant blue leaving a trail of light behind'.

T P. Kadidem, a literary caricaturist, satirist, writer of farces and comedies ripping with laughter, portrayed Gandhi in a poem called *The Recipe*, which is worth quoting here in full,

Into a bare handful of bone and skin
 Pour just an ounce of flesh and blood;
 Put in a heart love-full as sea is flood,
 Likewise a mind profound and free from sin;
 Fix on two Jumbo ears, two goo-goo eyes;
 Paint on a smile of babe at mother's breast,
 Include a soul that caps Himalay's crest
 And speaks with tongue which honey's sweet defines,
 The 'Stuffing'? Goat's milk, soyas beans and dais;
 Now, cover to brim with suffering human tears
 And bake this dish in gas for unpeppery years;
 Take out and 'garnish' it with punch notes;
 Wrap it in rags, prop up with lath bamboo,

And serve : The world redeemer—our Bāpā !

Gopālakṛṣṇa Adiga, a Kannaḍa poet who is a teacher of English literature in one of the Mysore colleges, wrote a poem entitled *Gāndhī the Father of the Nation*, which closes with these lines :

Those who fail would wake up, Oh ! wake up to tread his path,
Those who fail would cling, cling his chariot,
Those who fail would win, win the riches of his immortal spirit
His is the only way ; the rest is fruitless.
His is the only goal ; the rest is vain desire.

T.N. Śrīkanṭha, who is now professor of Kannaḍa in the University of Mysore, spoke of Gāndhī thus in a poem of his :

The teacher who with uplifted hand proclaimed to the world the
highest of human truths, *ahimsā* ;
The hero who won a victory over might with courage, over arms
with fortitude,
Encompassed crookedness with truth.

He described Gāndhī as 'the armour of those who are the lowliest and the low'.

B.H. Śrīdhara sang of Gāndhī as 'the new Buddha', 'the fearless soul who stood by those stricken with fear', 'with heart as soft as butter, the new saviour'. Q.P. Rājaraman, well-known poet of Bangalore, found in Gāndhī's life an ocean into which several rivers and rivulets have entered. He compared him to a great luminary made up of a thousand rays. R.S. Magub, the author of a comprehensive history of Kannaḍa literature, wrote in a poem 'Here is the divine voice which utters "Love is all virtue, the queen that rules the world". When clouds darkened the paths of the earth, the Gāndhī ray penetrated the gloom and lighted up the path of love. To him love is truth and truth is love'. P.T. Narasimhaiah, a famed poet of Karnataka, wondered 'who can know the secret of this determined strength' which goes to shame all diplomacy. K.S. Narasimhaśastry, the author of a popular collection of poems known as *Mahatma Mahatma* (Mysore Jasmund) wrote : 'Rāma and Aṣhā are one'—with this on your lips you wandered in Noakhali, wiping the tears of those who hid, built the bridge of friendship and unfurled the banner of peace, and called the millions to heed the call !

Some of these poets spoke of the agony of soul that filled their hearts on the Mahatma's passing away. Then came the time for them to settle down to the tasks of the post-Gāndhian era and reflect

and plan for the dawn of a new age in India in which human affairs were to be shaped in accordance with the principles and program of life laid down by the Mahatmā. Emotional challenge had to yield to intellectual comprehension, logical analysis and practical implementation. Kannada prose naturally became the appropriate medium of expression for the communication of Gandhian thought. Books and articles began to pour out of the press, dealing with Gandhi's ideas concerning political, economic and social reconstruction, histories of the freedom movement, stirring stories of the civil disobedience movements and no-tax campaigns, life in prison of the Janyāgrahī and the like. R. R. Divdkar wrote the story of the no-tax campaign in North Karnataka.

One of Divdkar's earliest works, published in 1933, was *Maḷḷigara Kapak* (The Villagers' Hand-book). Its purpose was to create an enthusiasm among the rural folk for Gandhi's Constructive Program. In *Sereya Maveyali* (Behind Prison Bars) he gave an account of his experiences in jail from his college days to the time of the Quit India movement in 1945. He says in this book: 'It was the aśvil on which my life has been hammered into shape. I realized my inner self.' His other Kannada works are *Stories of Gandhi*, *Bāpā*, *Satyāgraha—Prakāsa Motu Tāra*, *Mahatmāna Manovēda*, and *Gāndhīji—Nā Kanyāsa*, which are Kannada translations of works in English by himself and by others. His *Gāndhīji—His Life and Work* was published in 1945 on Gandhi's 75th birthday, and in 1947 he published in Kannada the Golden Jubilee Volume of the Congress, giving the history of its sixty years work, its achievements and its methods of work. As an interpreter of Gandhian technique, as a Gandhian philosopher and thinker, and as a journalist who has kept his journals steadily on the Gandhian track, Divdkar is without a peer.

One of the finest dramas on Gandhi is G. P. Bhaṅgathum's *Saṁskāranta Yēra Yēra*, in which he brings on the stage the great world teachers like Zoroaster, Buddha and Christ who brought messages appropriate for each age and Gandhi who, as the fulfilment of them all, has become the channel of the message which is much needed by the modern world.

Burā Bada Mādhava, a Gandhian constructive worker and an enterprising publisher, has been bringing out a series of thoughtful books in Kannada known as *Mādhava Bāḷi*. This series embodies a synthesis of world thought and Indian thought and contains in it several works having for their theme the life and teachings of Gandhi. Among other such publishers are the Loka Śāṅkara Trust, the Vaidya

Sāhitya, the Caitanya Prakāśana, the Gāndhī Sāhitya Saṅgha, and the Seva Saṅgha, which have to their credit a series of publications on Gāndhīan thought. These include a work called *Gāndhī Vāda* by Y. S. Narayana Rāu, works on Gāndhī by M. Bhadraraj and translations of books by Mahatma and J. C. Kumārappa. The Sarva Seva Saṅgha is specialising in books dealing with Gāndhī and Vinobā, and a best-seller of theirs at the present time is the Kannada translation of Vinobā's *Old Prisoners*. Thus none can now complain of paucity of Gāndhīan literature in Kannada.

Owing to lack of space only passing mention can be made of Kannada novelists who show a decided Gāndhīan influence. Basavaraja Kattimaga and T. R. Subba Rāu are two novelists who readily come to mind. Goḷa Rāmavarma Aṣṭāgṛha wrote a novel called *Moravante* (Procession), in which he dealt on a vast canvas with the features of the Gāndhīan era that were in the making. Śravantha Kamest, the famous writer of South Canara, wrote a novel called *Audīyada Uṇḍelli*, which bears the impress of Gāndhīan ideas. Goḷak's *Samarasava Jīvana* is a novel evidencing the influence of Gāndhī and Aureliando and other modern forces on a sensitive modern mind. Two novels by Śrīraṅga, one on *Prakṛi* and the other on *Paras*, are an interweaving of a philosophical thread into the picture of social life in India. Gāndhīan ways of thinking are also a strand in it.

All this new literature in Kannada has been acting as the spear-head of a new way of thinking and living which was placed before us by Gāndhī. Conflict of ideas, the ferment of new thought, the stresses and strains of modern life and the slow infiltration into them of Gāndhīan ways of thinking are the features of the new age in Kannada literature. Many revolutionary writers are giving expression to the rapid changes in our social life. Under the impact of Gāndhism, new attitudes towards 'untouchability', the treatment of women, and other problems are taking shape in the present-day writers.

The prominent note in Kannada literature today is human sympathy towards the poor, the unfortunate, the under-privileged, the neglected and the condemned. This widening sound of interest from aristocratic and plutocratic society to the society of the poor and the humble, to people working in the farm and factory, their simple joys and sorrows, and the impact of modern life on them, may be directly or indirectly traced to the impact of Gāndhīan ideas.

Brahmacharya and Human Destiny

WILLIAM ROBERT MILLER

Miss Wynne-Tyson does well to point to the deeper current in the life and thought of Gandhi, indicating as she does in 'The True Significance of Gandhi'¹ that it is not possible to gather the fruits of Gandhism without first planting the seed. As we plant, so shall we harvest. To look for easy schemes of non-violence is no less foolhardy in its way than expecting untrained conscripts to handle effectively the complex technological weapons of modern warfare.

Yet unwittingly Miss Wynne-Tyson has sought to reduce this deeper current also to methodology. She is not altogether to be blamed, for much of what she says is directly from Gandhi. What an unusual being, combining as he did a profound spirituality with a keen practical mind—and that flair for the dramatic, that exquisite sense of timing, as illustrated by such an idea as the Salt March, which belong to the realm of art!

How does such a man see himself from within? The aspect that is most easily communicable is of course the practical, and we see it again and again impinging on the spiritual and imaginative. The humility of a great man is a curious thing. It is only a man who has travelled a long hard road towards perfection who can say, 'I am far from being perfect. I am simply a humble aspirant for perfection.' For even the quest of perfection is not to be considered lightly. These words of Gandhi would sound pompous and priggish on the lips of a lesser man. It is in a like fashion that we must view the ease with which the master objectifies for his people the subjective course of his quest.

1. See *Gandhi Monthly*, October 1938.

Modesty (by no means false) forbids him to say, 'Here is my recipe'; his own subjectivity is first extracted and we are presented with a course of disciplines presumed to be objectively valid for all.

Now, to paraphrase both Gandhi and Miss Wynne-Tyson, to find the 'mind of Christ' within oneself, one must first abstain from sex, violence, property and wealth, and one must be truthful or honest. The last of these is somewhat equivocal, since to attain truth is, after all, to achieve the objective of the quest. However phrased, most of these 'five vows' are negative, sacrificial, death-oriented. To give up sex is to sever one's biological link with the future of humanity. To give up violence is to relinquish one's life (and perhaps the lives of others whom one could protect with violence) rather than cause willful injury to another. To give up all one's belongings is to direct oneself of material security, to risk starvation or destruction by the elements. To follow such a course is to detach oneself from the world, or as the Apostle Paul says, 'I have died unto the world, and Christ lives in me'.

And what is this 'Christ'? We see it in Jesus of Nazareth and again in Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi—and in more or less degrees of actualisation in other men who are made of the same flesh that all of us are made of. In the 'five vows' we get one glimpse of the 'mind of Christ'; in the Sermon on the Mount—the whole of it, not just the Beatitudes—we get another glimpse.

But if 'mind' is all we are concerned with, we may go into any monastery, or into the classrooms of a theological seminary, or into any Gandhian *dharm*. I do not possess any statistics on the number of ascetics in the world throughout history, nor on the number of moral teachers, nor on the number of proponents of Gandhism, but I think it is safe to say that they considerably out-number the authentic saints and martyrs who might be said to possess, with Jesus and Gandhi, the *spirit* of Christ.

Kierkegaard, in his *Training in Christianity*, makes a telling distinction between 'followers' and 'admirers'. Some 800,000,000 people throughout the world are delighted to bask in the reflected glory of Jesus Christ; they call themselves Christians. They worship Jesus as the Christ, which is to say that they are proud of him, they wish him well, they admire him exceedingly, and sometimes (thinking no doubt of the heavenly rewards rather than of the agony of the cross) they wish they were like him. Jesus of course did not seek worshippers or admirers: he said, 'Come, take up your cross daily and follow me'. It is quite conceivable that there are more people who, in this sense,

truly embody the spirit of Christ, answering Jesus on his own terms, outside the fold of the official Christian churches than within them—but wherever they may be they are marvellously rare unless we are to equate with the spirit of Christ merely any mood of ordinary kindness, good manners or common courtesy.

Any man can embody the mind and spirit of Christ—a lawyer, a carpenter, a frail or a robust man. We are all created in the image of God; we all are given the potentiality of becoming imbued with that transcendent power of divine love manifested in Jesus and in Gandhi. No human being is constitutionally disfranchised of the opportunity.

Adherents of liberal Christianity are often fond of thinking that Gandhi came along to 'pick up the work where Jesus left off', to furnish a blueprint, so to speak, that can enable God's will to be done more intelligibly and expeditiously. Yet has the copious legacy of 'scripture' by and about Gandhi advanced us one jot from where Jesus left us? It might more truly be said that Gandhi is a kind of secondary revelation set before us to remind us that the terms are still as hard to meet as before. Each man's quest and mission are framed in the language of his era, yet do not both of them come to this—that the seeker after truth must renounce the world at whatever cost or risk? This is the deeper stream, the divine fount, the 'Christians' that lies beneath the commendable ethic of 'love thy neighbour' in the ethical teachings of Jesus and beneath the practical satyagraha that attracted the masses to Gandhi.

Miss Wynne-Tyson presents us with a black-and-white picture of reality when she states that 'we are faced with the possible extinction of the human species unless we are willing, at last, to obey'—unless we apply the 'remedy' of the 'Galilean Prophet'. Let us wrestle with this dictum for a moment. She is aware that 'it will not be an easy matter' to get everyone to take the five vows which she says 'alone make the policy of ahimsa . . . possible and effective'. In other words, if I may deliberately caricature her logic, if only everyone would give up sex, etc., ahimsa becomes possible among the ageing survivors in a childless world. Thus we are to be saved from extinction only by voluntarily and cooperatively proselytizing the extinction of the human species.

It is obvious that mankind cannot, as a whole, improve human life on earth by renouncing it *en masse*. There is a dichotomy between

the spiritual and the material which, in the spirit of Christ, becomes a clear cleavage: an 'either/or' proposition. Does this mean that the way to God has only an supreme sacrifice and world-renunciation? Perhaps so, at the end of history; and it is at least plausible that the way of the spirit of Christ finally must lead all of mankind into direct emulation of Jesus and Gândhî. But their significance may not solely be as exemplars. Indeed, as exemplars they are always the subject of dilution and delusion: rather than crucify themselves on the model of Jesus, men water him down to the dimensions of a mere 'prophet' or 'teacher' or 'kindly man', and persuade themselves that by ordering their lives on the 'pattern' of Jesus—or Gândhî—they have become disciplined followers. I do not wish to discredit such men, many of whom tower above me in moral stature, but it must be pointed out, for example, that there is a tremendous difference between a madman conducting a fast unto death, or a man blessing his persecutors while he hangs on a cross dying a dog's death armed their jeers and cuffs, and a comfortably situated man like Thoreau spending a night in jail over a matter of principle.

I advisedly mention Thoreau because he is a link between Jesus and Gândhî, and the most significant one with regard to Gândhî's social impact. We have been concerned, in all of the above, with Gândhî's spiritual depth. But we are led towards that concern first by the visible impress of his life on the social history of our era. In these terms, what is the relevance of the mind and spirit of Christ? If it is a call to universal world-renunciation, it is a call that falls on deaf ears except that all of mankind might fully heed that call, but it is nevertheless not wasted. Despite its woeful degeneration and perversion in the course of time (perhaps this was why a Gândhî had to come), Christianity has done much good in the world. We do not have the same perspective of time from which to view the impact of Gândhî, but there is something of a similar kind in the dynamism of his life and work—like a boulder cast into a brook: first the big splash, then capricious waves attenuated by grassy and by the current of the stream. Already there is occasion for disappointment in the careers of some of the disciples; and we see in many places the use of *satyagraha* methods completely divorced from the vital motivating spirit. Yet in figures like Vinobâ Bâver, something lives on that is perhaps analogous to the faith of the early Apostles.

For the man of faith—a Jesus or Paul, a Gândhî or Vinobâ—the inner light of the spirit is what leads one through the world towards some moonlit horizon destination. God has that path to no man.

But for many of us who are of little faith, it is such a light shining through such men that illumines the world itself and causes us to see the reality that dwells within the appearance of things. If there is such a thing as human progress, it is because ordinary men, although not willing to surrender the comforts of this world, are lifted up a little from the scramble for existence and, guided by a star which they do not wish to reach, find ways to live more humanly as brothers to one another. In the final analysis, the pursuit of perfection to which Gandhi's 'five vows' refer is not an inescapable challenge to mankind (it will be escaped, as it long has been), nor a mandate to all men (it will not be obeyed), but simply a proposal to him who confronts it. Here, says Gandhi, is what I had to do; if you would do as I did, you must make these vows a part of you. Significantly, however, no one handed Gandhi this set of vows; they emerge out of the fabric of his life: they are the expression of his spiritual needs put into objective form. But for another man, even one who wishes ardently to 'follow' Gandhi, not merely to 'admire' him by repeating his ideas, he must grapple within his own soul to apprehend that same spirit, to grasp that essence of Gandhi which transcends the mortal man and his words, to receive that Word from which the words derive—and the discipline that emerges, while perhaps bearing some resemblance to Gandhi's vows, will in all likelihood have its own character and nuance.

Just as for conducting scientific experiments there is an indispensable scientific course of instruction, in the same way strict preliminary discipline is necessary to qualify a person to make experiments in the spiritual realm. Therefore we have the belief based upon experience, that those who would make individual search after truth as God, must go through several vows, as for instance, the vow of truth, the vow of *brahmacharya* (purity)—for you cannot possibly divide your love for Truth and God with anything else—the vow of non-violence, of poverty and non-possession. Unless you impose on yourself the five vows, you may not embark on the experiment at all.

Gandhi in *Young India*, 1931

Book Reviews

Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi Volume 2, 1896-1897, 1958, Delhi, Government of India 388 p. Rs 8.50

This is the second of a chain of several volumes planned to be brought out within the next few years. It contains basic material direct from the pen of Mahatma Gandhi during the year 1896-97. The scene is, therefore, South Africa. The book portrays one of the earliest phases in the evolution of Gandhi. The shy, gentle but truthful Gandhi found himself suddenly thrown into troubles and conflicts challenging his own honour as a man and, even more, his honour as an Indian. Gandhi was then a young lawyer and his faith in the British Empire was still clear and bright. His battle was against racial discrimination within that very Empire. Every document published in this volume reveals Gandhi in the role of a perfect constitutionalist. He drew up petitions, wrote articles, interviewed people, big and small, and explained tirelessly the justice of the cause of Indians in South Africa. He never exaggerated. He was precise and he presented facts without varnish. The truth and

nothing but the truth came from him. He never lost his patience and pressed his case again and again. He never yielded either. Gandhi who later discovered *satyagraha* and the techniques of non-violent revolution was undergoing initiation in the full process of constitutional methods. How often did not Gandhi say in later years that *satyagraha* can be started only after exhausting every avenue of constitutional procedure. Only once or twice, during this period, did he come to the limit beyond which there was no constitutional remedy open to him; and then there escaped from him such words as, 'We can then only cry out in anguish', and again, 'We must conquer the hatred by love'. Here are the first birth-pangs of *satyagraha* which was yet to come. We see dimly, like shadows on a wall, how Gandhi pressed constitutional methods to the limit and was then slowly sensing the grim truth that in a dispute affecting fundamental human freedoms and values, in which one side deliberately and openly denies them while the other is fighting for them constitutionally, all such action comes up finally against an impenetrable barrier and something more than constitutional endeavour becomes necessary. No understanding of Gandhi or of the technique of *satyagraha* is possible without a clear study of this phenomenon as elucidated from Gandhi's own words in this volume.

Not the least remarkable among the materials presented in this book is a detailed statement of expenses personally incurred by Gandhi while he toured in India in connection with his South African mission. Gandhi has accounted for every little penny of the public money given to him. Here again is another secret of how he was able to inspire confidence in those who gave him financial assistance and to collect the biggest public funds ever known in India.

The editor deserves congratulations for the materials collected, the careful sequential arrangement and the excellent foot-notes and references.

G. R.

B. R. Nanda. *Mahatma Gandhi - A Biography*. 1938 London Allen and Unwin 542 p 15s.

The author of this book occupies a high office under the Government of India; and from such a source the book is a complete and delightful surprise. We have had many biographies of Gandhi by Indians and foreigners. The main current of the story is now much too well known. Nevertheless, as B. R. Nanda relates the story, there is a certain freshness and objectivity about it and a good deal of new light is thrown upon events, personalities and interpretations. For the first time, we have many confidential documents published in this book. This is certainly a re-

markable feature. The second equally remarkable feature is best stated in the words of Lord Attlee, who mentions it in his brilliant review of the book in the *Spectator*: 'Admiring and understanding him here, he is yet fair to the other protagonists in the drama. He appreciates the difficulties of Viceroy and civil servants. He never yields to the bitterness and exaggeration which one might expect'. This is certainly worthwhile testimony from the man who was the Prime Minister of England when India parted from British rule, to become an independent sovereign republic.

The author builds up the story of Gandhi from childhood to death in a carefully arranged chronological series of pen-pictures which are drawn with objectivity, remarkable understanding and a wide grasp of the innumerable factors involved. Throughout he correctly interprets Gandhi as a man of peace, ever ready to settle every issue through friendly negotiations, provided that an honourable settlement was aimed at. There is one particular event in the first non-cooperation movement under Gandhi, about which even some of his principal henchmen differed from him rather violently and even charged him with gross mis-handling of a crucial situation. This is the withdrawal of Civil Disobedience after the Chauri Chauri incident, and that only a

few weeks after Gandhi had delivered what was considered to be an ultimatum to the Viceroy. The Chauri Chauri incident was an attack by an angry mob on a police station which was set on fire and as a result of which 22 policemen were burnt to death. Gandhi firmly held that this incident, coming in the wake of a few earlier outbursts of mob-violence, clearly showed that violence had crept into the movement and might ultimately disrupt it. As the leader of the non-violent revolution, it was his unalterable thesis that the incursion of violence into the movement would weaken it just as any sudden acceptance of non-violence in an armed war would weaken such a war. This was the logic of non-violence in a non-violent revolution. B. R. Nandi's analysis of this event and his reasoned assessment of it fills out with wonder as to how an official and a non-combatant in the struggle could so well size up the inside of the story. His quotation from the autobiography of Nehru in this connection, that 'the decision was right; he (Gandhi) had to stop the rot and build anew', shows that the author has in him the gift of marshalling a case to the point of apt drama.

This book is more than political biography. It is an essay in interpretation, and that at a high level. The chapter entitled 'Rural Economics', revealing Gandhi as a great nation-builder from the village

level upwards, is again a testimony of the author's intimate grasp of the ideology and methodology of Gandhi. B. R. Nandi does not denigrate Gandhian economics with a contemptuous wave of his hand, like insufferable so-called intellectuals and particularly of the variety bred in our Universities. As he says at the proper place, 'those who had learnt to think of India in terms of the economics they learnt at the University or in the seminars of political parties were not always able to appreciate the real problems of India'. 'The central idea in Gandhi's mind was to relieve the grinding poverty that stalked the village. He shrank from the idea of further pauperising the villages for the greater prosperity of the big towns. Rather than turn the wheels of a few gigantic plants, he wished hundreds of thousands of cottages in the countryside to hum with activity, to cater to their own needs as well as to send their wares to towns'. Gandhi was not a theoretician but an intensely practical man dealing with practical problems as they faced him from day to day.

The chapters on the transfer of power are written with ability, detachment and fairness to everybody concerned. He has interpreted Gandhi's role in it with understanding and courage. Here is his summing up: 'The final consummation in 1947, the transfer of power, was due to the interaction of numerous national and world forces, but there

is no doubt that the timing and method of British withdrawal were influenced by what Gandhi had said and done for a quarter of a century'.

There is much more that can be said to show that this latest biography of Gandhi is one of the best we have had so far. It is the kind of book that can be prescribed for the University students without hesitation. It is written in a style that is easy, clear and vivid. The author has written effortlessly and in a manner which puts no strain on the mind of the reader.

G. R.

Abul Kalam Azad. *India Wins Freedom* 1959. Calcutta. Orient Longmans. 152 p. Rs 12.50.

It is not often that a political leader of the eminence of Maulana Azad can stand aside and present objectively the course of events he has helped to shape. The Maulana has done this in the posthumously published autobiography, with unusual frankness and forthrightness. Indeed the inner story of the partition of India as the price of our freedom has seldom been told with such feeling and intimate knowledge. The part played by Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru in the freedom struggle is handsomely acknowledged. But as President of the Congress during the crucial years of the war it was his job to negotiate with the British Govern-

ment and the other parties in the country, and the Maulana's account of his activities is as vivid as it is undoubtedly provocative.

In the course of a Preface *Shri* Hamidun Kahr has told us how the book came to be written. For an autobiography the procedure is strange and uncommon. But Azad was one of the principal actors in the transfer of power from British to Indian hands and was persuaded to make a record of his reading of those memorable times for the benefit of posterity. Kahr relieved him of the actual burden of writing. The Maulana was dictating his experience in picturesque Urdu, copious notes were taken of the talks and the completed script in English was submitted and approved. The central theme of this volume—as its title indicates—is the way freedom was won, while the Maulana had planned to write the first and third volumes in due course. That was not to be and Azad died before this volume was published.

Ever since its inception the Congress always stood for a united India. Unity and independence—that has been its slogan these many many years. How then could it agree to partition? The Maulana says that he had devised a plan to which he had obtained the consent of the Congress, the League and the Viceroy, but a last-minute

statement by Jawaharlal gave a loophole to Mr Jinnah and he backed out of his commitment. 'I am convinced', says Aird, 'that the scheme I framed on the occasion of the Cabinet Mission and which the Mission largely accepted was a far better solution from every point of view. If we had remained steadfast and refused to accept partition, I am confident that a safer and more glorious future would have awaited us.' One can't be so sure. Jinnah was an astute strategist and he knew what would serve his purpose. Congress asked the British to quit first, as that alone would make for unity. The League asked them to divide and quit. The problem posed was—partition and freedom or union with continued subjection. The choice was of course difficult and heart-surching, and there was always ground for divided counsel. Who can say if they did well or ill to accept the inevitable alternative? There is no point in saying 'I anticipated this' or 'I knew this would happen'. Whichever way you decide you are impaled on the horns of a dilemma.

The Maulana says it was a mistake to have given the Finance portfolio to the League nominees, as finance is the pivot of the administration, and that the Sardar was ill-advised in sticking to the Home Ministry. Are you so sure? The coalition government clearly

showed it was impossible to carry on the administration with the League and the Congress pulling in different ways. League propaganda had vitiated the morale of the Executive, and authority found itself confronted with disloyal and unreliable elements at every level. And then, who that has ever seen the miracle of the absorption of the States in the Union can doubt the Sardar's wisdom in sticking to his post? Who else could have done this difficult job?

The Maulana makes it clear that there were sharp differences of opinion among the leading lights of the Congress, as indeed might be expected of an intelligent and free people anywhere. But there was a common aim and a wholesome loyalty to the Mahatma whose heart was big enough to take in all at one stride. Why, to the Maulana himself and to Nehru non-violence was no more than a policy. And there were times when Nehru and Patel could not see eye to eye and all of them could not digest the Mahatma's idealism. Yet they worked together as a team, for the country could not afford to keep them apart. What was achieved, of course, fell far short of their aim; but that is about all that could be done under the circumstances and all of them laboured under inescapable limitations. All they could hope for was the second best.

The Maulana, as a scholar and statesman, was essentially a Liberal in his mental make-up. Caught up in the whirl of non-cooperation and revolutionary activity he was yet able to influence his colleagues in the direction of moderation. He rightly claims his share in urging Congress to contest the elections and accept office. 'I held that it would be a mistake to boycott elections. If the Congress did so, less desirable elements would capture the central and provincial legislatures and speak in the name of the Indian people.' This is plain common sense. The Maulana scored in such matters, much to the advantage of the Congress.

But on the question of partition the Maulana is definitely controversial. We know that Qasabji swore by unity. But what could be done, with the League intransigent and the third party willing to oblige? Only one thing could have averted partition—British firmness against division; but that was never in evidence. And Mr Jinnah who knew he would be lost and nowhere in a wider sphere had the honour of the day to his heart's content. Unity was wrecked on the rock of one man's colossal vanity. And we have a partition which has by no means eliminated the communal problem.

The Maulana, who at the outset felt that his colleagues had

blundered in their handling of the League, finds himself sobered and not so sure of his judgement towards the close. 'We cannot today say which reasoning is correct', he confesses. 'History alone will decide whether we acted wisely and correctly in accepting partition.' Let us leave the matter there. For history does not always repeat itself. And who knows if the conditions that favoured freedom, though with partition, would yet repeat themselves in the near future?

B.N.

Jawaharlal Nehru. *A Book of Old Letters*. 1938. Bombay. Asia Publishing House. 511 p. Rs 12.50.

Old letters of politicians in particular, dealing with the dead past, are seldom edifying. They are apt to seem like making a crisis of every passing incident and their personal squabbles are undoubtedly petty in the light of the fading years. Yet Jawaharlal's collection of 366 letters from personages ranging from Mahatma Qasabji to Edward Thompson is vastly entertaining. For one thing the period covered by the letters—the thirty years preceding independence—is one of the most fruitful in our political history; and the persons and personalities that gathered round the Mahatma are not too far removed as he lost in oblivion. As Nehru says in his

You are in the habit of proclaiming that you stand by yourself and represent nobody else and that you are not attached to any party. Occasionally you say this in a manner as if you are either proud or happy because of it. At the same time, you call yourself a Socialist—sometimes, a full-blooded Socialist. How a Socialist can be an individualist, as you regard yourself, beats me . . .

To be brutally frank, you sometimes behaved in the Working Committee as a spoilt child, and often lost your temper. Now, in spite of all your 'nervousness' and jumpiness, what results did you achieve? You would generally hold forth for hours together and then succumb at the end. Sardar Patel and the others had a clever technique for dealing with you. They would let you talk and talk and they would ultimately finish up by asking you to draft the resolution. Once you were allowed to draft the resolution, you would feel happy, no matter whose resolution it was. Rarely have I found you sticking to your point till the last . . .

Nehru's reply to this indictment is a noble piece of sanity and self-restraint which bespeaks the budding statesman. He is com-

pletely free from malice and has no time for the invalidities of a personal controversy. Nehru has shed the old impulsive reactions of his earlier days and cultivated a maturer mood of tolerance and magnanimity as befits one destined to play the high role for which he was shaping.

Your letter is essentially an indictment of my conduct and an investigation into my failings. It is, as you will well realise, a difficult and embarrassing task to have to reply to such an indictment. But so far as the failings are concerned, or many of them as any rate, I have little to say. I plead guilty to them, well realising that I have the misfortune to possess them.

He added :

To my misfortune, I am affected by international happenings more than I should be. There is no need for me to discuss my own failings which you point out. I admit them and regret them. You are right in saying that as President I functioned often as a secretary or a glorified clerk. I have long developed the habit of being my own secretary and clerk, and I fear I encroach in this way on others' preserves. It is also true that because of the Congress resolutions have tended to

become long and verbose and rather like those. In the Working Committee, I fear, I talked too much and did not always behave as I should.

We must be content with a random selection. Tagore wrote to Nehru on 22 July 1937 :

My province is clever but morally untrained and supercilious in her attitude towards her neighbours, she breaks into violent hysterical fits when least crossed in her whims. I know her weakness but I cannot maintain my detachment of mind and passively acquiesce in her doom of perdition.

Sarojini is as usual lyrical in her appreciation of Jawahar. Her letters are stamped with a style like thorn-pearls. On hearing of his election as Congress President in 1939 she wrote :

I lay awake till late into the night thinking of the significance of the words I had used so often in reference to you, that you were predestined to a splendid martyrdom. As I watched your face while you were being given the honouring ovation on your election, I felt I was embracing both the Coronation and the Crucifixion—indeed the two are inseparable and almost synonymous in some circumstances and some situations. . . .

Among other letters included in the volume are those of Jinnah, Lajpat Rai, Bernard Shaw, Romain Rolland, Mao Tse-tung, Lord Wavell, Stafford Cripps, Harold Laski etc. It will be seen that Nehru does not omit letters which are critical of him or his government. Witness this one from Gandhi in 1937 when Congress accepted office.

The Rs 500 salary with a big house and car allowances is being severely criticised. The more I think of it, the more I dislike this extravagant beginning.

Altogether this 'mixed collection' truly reflects the hopes and aims and fears and struggles of the men who strove for independence and got it under the matchless leadership of Mahatma Gandhi.

B.N.

Fytrelle, Mahatma Gandhi, *The Last Phase*. 2 volumes 1956 & 1958, Ahmedabad, Navajvan Publishing House. Rs 20 each.

A great figure of mankind is not kept alive in pictures no matter how good they are nor how well they catch the living likeness and subtle gestures and expressions. We are grateful, of course, for all the motion pictures of Mahatma Gandhi; for all the excellent pictures that reveal his most

characteristic poses. Yet Gandhi is so much more than any physical appearance; his legacy to mankind is found in all his relationships, in his actions that have been recorded, and in the communication by word which was, for him, his most important means of expression. His life is his message to men—it must be understood in words that come from the depths of his communion with truth—with God. His words, therefore, are more than words—they are the symbols of the inner life that became the outer life in his speech and actions.

Great men speak on different levels just as they are forced to live on different levels. Often all we have of them are their exalted utterances which separate them from the ordinary people for whom they have given their lives. They are not recorded as human beings—what is often regarded as insignificant or immediate, personal judgments is discarded or forgotten. Yet this material may be the very record that will humanize and personalize the heroic stature that seems super-human, and remote.

The debt of gratitude which the world owes to Pyarelal may be described in terms of this recording of Gandhi's acts and words—both ordinary and exalted—in the critical years from 4 May 1944 to the death of Gandhi in January

1948. The record fills two huge volumes, simply called *Mahatma Gandhi. The Last Phase*.

In a very real way this massive report of the last 'phase' is a description of the meaning of satyagraha as it matured in Gandhi and was put to such effective and tremendous use in the crucial days of India's struggle for independence. The recording has been done by the person best fitted to put down what Gandhi thought, felt, and did. Pyarelal was secretary, editor, and close companion of Gandhi. The detail will serve later to recreate for future generations what pictures cannot portray and what the few speaking records cannot possibly record.

The faithful four years are now put down by minutes, almost seconds. Time cannot figure in the work of 'soul force' nor can time estimate the eternal truths that are here given local habitation. Time alone will tell whether the 'soul force' finds habitation in the lives of men. Here is a bible for the reference of men present and men to come who seek the way of truth and love. It is the evidence that this way is both practical and effective when it is embodied in the lives of devoted servants of mankind.

H.E.

The Gandhi Smarak Nidhi

Its Work and Plans

G. RAMACHANDRAN
Secretary : Gandhi Smarak Nidhi

INTRODUCTION

The Gandhi Smarak Nidhi (the Gandhi National Memorial Fund) was raised in India soon after the passing away of Mahatma Gandhi on 30 January 1948. The rich and the poor alike contributed voluntarily and gratefully to this Fund. It was raised for the express purpose of furthering Gandhi's teachings and the different items of the Constructive Program which he had insisted in his own lifetime and to which he had given all his personal care and much of his time. The Constructive Program was, and continues to be, a many-sided and integrated scheme of village reconstruction.

SIZE OF THE FUND

The Fund originally stood at the maximum of about Rs 106

million. In the course of the following years interest accruing from the corpus of the Fund reached a total of about Rs 29 million. Until the end of 1958, expenditure under various heads authorised by the Executive Committee of the Fund totalled about Rs 62 million. Some idea of the extent of expenditure from year to year may be had from the fact that the budgets sanctioned in 1959 for schemes directly sponsored by the Fund and for grants to various organisations and institutions engaged in the Gandhian Constructive Program came to all to about Rs 13 million.

At this rate of expenditure the Gandhi National Memorial Fund, as it stands, may well be exhausted within the next five years. This will not mean that the various

institutions and programs of work now going on with the aid of the Fund will close down. Quite a number of them will continue on their own on the basis of the strength and momentum generated during the intervening years.

OUR WORK AT A GLANCE

We have now 17 State Boards of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi in the different States of India. Each State Board consists of nine members, with a chairman, a treasurer and a member-secretary. There is also in each State Board at least one woman member, one representative of the Harijans and one chosen Grāmsevā and Tatva-prachārak. These State Boards organise and look after all our items of work in the different States and administer the funds placed at their disposal for schemes of work approved by the Executive Committee.

There are in all now 140 Grāmsevā (Village Reconstruction) Centres and 50 Major Tatva-prachār Centres (study centres for spreading the teachings of Gandhi) throughout India. Each Grāmsevā Centre has generally a minimum of three full-time trained workers and each Major Tatva-prachār Centre at least one full-time worker. We have then our Gandhi Memorial Leprosy Foundation and the All-India Sangrakshalayas (Gandhi Memorial Museums) Board, for each

of which has been set apart Rs 10 million for its work. There are also some other bodies set up by the Fund, like the Central Publications Committee, the Gandhi Film Committee and the Bhagat Mukti Samiti (the committee for the removal of scavengering on the basis of caste).

OUR NUMBER AND STRENGTH

There are thus about a thousand full-time workers engaged in the above programs of work. This is certainly a very small number plunged in a population of about 400 million people. We therefore try to derive strength more from the quality of the work we do than from its volume, and through co-operation with many other organisations and institutions working in the country, like Sarva Seva Sangh, the Sarvodaya Mandals set up by Āśārya Vinobaji, the National Extension Service, the Khadi and Village Industries Commission, the Social Welfare Board and the Bhārat Sevak Samiti. We are thus participants, consistent with our resources and capacity, in the great and thrilling adventure of nation-building from the village-level upwards through cooperative endeavours and down-to-earth work among the people.

GRANTS-IN-AID

The Gandhi National Memorial Fund has during the last ten years given considerable financial assist-

ance to all-India organisations of Constructive Work started by Gandhiji, like the Harijan Sevak Sangh, the Hindustani Taluk Sangh, the Bharatya Adhyatmi Sevā Sangh and the Kasturba Gandhi National Memorial Trust, and to the Gandhi Works Publication Committees in different States, amounting to Rs 14 millions.

The Bhāratīya-Chintānā Movement and the Gitan-Nirmāṇ Program which came in its wake have received from the Fund Rs 5 million.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

During the last one year we took certain steps to make our work more efficient, real and progressive. These steps were, firstly, the decentralisation of our administration, and secondly, the reorganisation of our Gitanmālā Centres on a new pattern and based on an integrated program which we have called our 'Pāṇimukhi Program'. This program consists of five major items: (a) More food and better food, (b) More sanitation and better health, (c) More cottage and village industries and better income, (d) More Basic and Social Education and better citizenship and (e) More cultural and recreational programs and better living. The third step we took was the reorganization of our Tattva-prasār Centres to carry out precise programs with specific objectives and to concentrate on selected centres in each State with

large student populations instead of frittering away funds and energy on innumerable and inconsequential smaller centres.

The fourth step was the integration of the inspection of accounts and the inspection of work through a select and expert cadre given special orientation for the purpose.

The fifth step was the setting up of the All-India Sangrahalaya Board with Smt. Suchet Kripplān, Vice-Chairman of the Fund, as its Chairman. The Fund has given Rs 10 million for the work of this Board. It has drawn up a program of seven Gandhi National Memorial Museums in different parts of India which will become living institutions of study, research and work particularly among students and youth. Of these, the museum at Madurai was opened recently by Prime Minister Nehru and the new building of the museum in Delhi is nearing completion. The other museums may be located in Bombay, Wardhā, Silcharati, Bāhr and Bengal.

PUBLICATIONS

Thus, in addition to the Gandhi Works Publication Committees in Tamiṇāḍ, Mysore, Kerala and Mahrāṣṭra, of which the first two have already brought out some volumes, the Fund has set up a Central Publications Committee to bring out small books containing interpretative literature on Gandhi

and priced within the reach of all.

GANDHI MAHO, the quarterly journal of the Fund in two separate English and Hindi editions, was started in January 1957 and during these three years has successfully attempted to extend the scope and meaning of Gandhian studies in the context of swiftly changing world events. The journal has increasingly become a forum of discussion for eminent writers and thinkers from all parts of the world.

LEPROSY WORK

The Gandhi Memorial Leprosy Foundation which came into existence in 1951 with an allocation of Rs 10 million from the Fund is continuing to do pioneering work in the fields of leprosy research, training, control and dissemination of information.

FILMS

The Gandhi Films Committee, which came into existence in 1950 under the personal direction and guidance of the late Sri Dewdas Gandhi, and which has now been linked with the Films Division of the Government of India, has procured over a lakh of feet of film material on Gandhi from all over the world and has produced out of these a full-length documentary entitled *Peace of India* and a shorter documentary (first of a projected series) entitled *Marjhee*. A total of Rs 7 lakh has been spent on this work.

GANDHI BHAVANS

Under the joint inspiration from our Chairman, Sri R. R. Dwivedi, and Sri C. D. Deshmukh, Chairman of the University Grants Commission, a program has been drawn up for the setting up of Gandhi Bhavans in the universities. Each Gandhi Bhavan will cost Rs 1 lakh, towards which the Fund and the University Grants Commission would each contribute Rs 50,000. As a first step, ten universities have come forward to establish these Gandhi Bhavans which are intended to be bright, active little centres of Gandhian studies and constructive work inside the university campuses.

GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

The Gandhi Peace Foundation, however, is the major new project of the Fund and has come directly from proposals put forward by the Chairman. The Foundation will be an international association for promoting research and studies in Gandhian thought and action based on truth and ahimsa and for bringing together people from all over the world who stand for the solution of all conflicts through peaceful methods and approaches. A small Pilot Committee, consisting among others of Dr S. Radhakrishnan, Vice-President of India, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Acharya J. B. Kripplani, has already worked out the broad outlines of the scheme and a simple and elastic Constitution has also been drawn up for

establishing and carrying on the work of the Foundation. The Fund has set apart Rs 10 million for building up the Foundation. The recent visits to India of Mr Richard B. Gregg, Dr Stuart Nelson, Dean of Howard University, U. S. A., and Dr Martin Luther King, Jr, sponsored by the Fund, have highlighted the scheme of the Gandhi Peace Foundation.

LOOKING AHEAD

Mahatma Gandhi has left behind a vast and precious heritage of revolutionary ideas affecting almost every aspect of the life of humanity and what is even more significant,

concrete techniques and methods of radical social change based on truth and non-violence. In every part of India, there are silent and earnest groups of workers firmly dedicated to these ideas and methods of work. We count ourselves fortunate that we are privileged to work in co-operation with them all and as each one of us in the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi attends to his or her work at the place allotted in the great program, we are conscious of the challenges that come both from the teachings of Gandhi and from the crucial needs arising from the crisis in human affairs which we all face today through the perils of an atomic war.

Cloth-bound gilt-titled

BOUND VOLUMES
of
GANDHI MARG, 1958

Small stock available

Rs 9.50 plus postage Rs 1.50

GANDHI SMARAK NIDHI

Raghat New Delhi

Indian Journal Of Adult Education

A Quarterly Journal devoted to Adult Education

Conference Special Number

DECEMBER 58

CONTENTS

Messages	:	:	<i>Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru</i>
		:	<i>Dr. Luther Evans</i>
Social Education in Urban Areas	:	:	<i>Scientific Documents</i>
Urban Social Education	:	:	<i>Dr. S. D. Panikar</i>
Community Centres in New English Housing Estates	:	:	<i>Swirel Harris</i>
Urban Community Centres Work in Under Developed Countries	:	:	<i>Peter Kesteven</i>
Second World Conference on Adult Education	:	:	<i>Richard Attygalle</i>
From The Archives	:	:	<i>Sir Shah Salaman's presidential address</i>

Rs. 5 (\$2.00) a year (March, June, October, Dec.)

Rs. 1.25 pays plus per issue

The Indian Adult Education Association

30, Fazl Bazar, Delhi.

"MANKIND"

A Monthly Magazine Devoted to
The Family of Man

A sheer necessity for every thinking person who desires a quicker,
warmer grasp of pressing modern problems.

such as Socialism, Democracy, Equality, and non-
violent revolution.

Stimulating! Non-sectarian! Constructive! This new type of magazine
puts "Items" "under the microscope"—without fear, favour or bias.
Chairman of the editorial board: Rammanohar Lohia.

Reserve your copy, today. At any good bookstall or seller's

*Features: Notes and Comments, Articles, Docu-
ments, Communications and Book
Reviews.*

Address:

3-4-9, Hanayasnagar, Hyderabad—A.P., India.

Subscription Rates:

Annual 10/-, Single copy Rs 1/-,
U.K. 25 sh, U.S.A 3 4.
2 Sh 6 d 35 a.

THE INDO-ASIAN CULTURE

Illustrated English Quarterly Journal

FOUNDED BY

THE INDIAN COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL RELATIONS

PATAUDI HOUSE, NEW DELHI.

Articles contributed by

Eminent Writers of India and other Countries

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

	INDIA	FOREIGN
Single Copy	Rs. 1/50	S. 2-60.
Annual	Rs. 6/-	Sh. 10/-

POST FREE

THOUGHT

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS AND THE ARTS

IS JUST THE MAGAZINE TO
HELP ONE UNDERSTAND
THE TEMPO, DYNAMICS AND DIRECTION OF
EVENTS IN INDIA AND ABROAD
AND TREND & DEVELOPMENTS IN
LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

KNOWN FOR ITS CRISITIVE APPROACH AND
INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY

THOUGHT

SEEMS TO PROMOTE UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
ASIA AND THE WEST

SUBSCRIPTION		India	ANNUAL	Rs. 11.00
			SINGLE COPY	27 PAISE PAISE ONLY
	Foreign :	ANNUAL	Rs. 21.50	
		Single Copy	.. 0.50	
Foreign	Am. Mail Edition	Annual		50r. Monthly
U.K., Europe & East Africa		£ 3.17		£ 2.00
America		\$ 18.00		\$ 9.50
Asia & Egypt		£ 3.17		£ 1.17

THOUGHT : 15 FAIZ BAZAR DELHI.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLICATIONS, TATA INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, BOMBAY-38.

	Rs.	sp.
DHARANI AN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SURVEY OF A VILLAGE	1/00	
GOING TO U.S.—A GUIDE. Krishnaswamy, G. S. and Krishnaswamy, J. M.	6/75	
HANDICAPPED CHILD. Wade, A. A. (Editor)	4/50	
OUR BEGGAR PROBLEM—HOW TO TACKLE IT. Krishnaswamy, J. M. (Editor)	5/25	
PUBLIC SHOPPING HABITS AND CONVENIENCES. Lawrence, A. M.	1/50	
SEX DELINQUENT WOMEN AND THEIR REHABILITATION. Pandey, G. B.	4/25	
SOCIAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT IN A HOSPITAL. Pandey, G. B.	1/00	
STUDENTS AND SOCIAL WORK—By Students and for Students	1/75	
TOWARDS BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE SICK CHILD. Pandey G.B.	1/75	

INDIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL WORK

(Quarterly) Prof. A. B. Wade, M. P. (Editor).

Yearly subscription for India Rs. 16/00, for U.S.A. \$4.00 & for other countries

Rs. 11/00. Back numbers of the Journal are available.

THE DRAMA OF THE BUILDING
OF THE
NEW ANDHRA PRADESH

IN

Special Issue of "SOCIAL WELFARE"

•

for JULY, 1959.

Price per copy
0.35 nP.

Yearly subscription
Rs. 4.00

Book your order to-day with your Bookseller or
direct with us by sending payment in advance.

THE PUBLICATIONS DIVISION

(SOCIAL WELFARE UNIT)

Post Box No. 2011, Old Sec-8,

DELHI-4.

Founded by Kshindramath Tagore

VISVABHARATI QUARTERLY

Old Series 1923-N. New Series from 1953

India's leading Journal of general cultural interest

Editor: KSHITIS ROY

Volume 34

Number 4

Spring 1959

ARTICLES**Centennial of Jagadishchandra Bose and Bipinchandra Pal**

Rabindranath Tagore

Rabindranath Tagore

Jagadishchandra Bose

Bipinchandra Pal

Bipinchandra Pal

To Jagadishchandra (A Poem)

One Friend to Another (Letters)

One Friend to Another (Letters)

The Ideas of Visva-Bharati

Rabindranath and Bengal

Tapaswini Chatterji

Rabindranath Tagore

Debabrata Sena

Ananda Sukhar Ray

Premendra Mitra

Kallidasa Ghoshacharya

Calcutta : From a Village to a City

The Nature of Literature

Methodology and Faith

A Testament of Unity

On Living. (A Poem)

Studies in Ethical Theory

ILLUSTRATIONS

Jagadishchandra in London (1903) : Photograph

Bhiksha Group (1900) : Photograph

Bipinchandra Pal. Poems by Rabindranath Tagore

Contributions, Exchange journals, Books for Review, Advertisement Material and
Annual Subscriptions of Rs. 5.00, 14 shillings or 3 dollars to be sent to

The Editor, VISVABHARATI Quarterly,
Sankarabharati Post, West Bengal, India.

GANDHIAN LITERATURE

BY MANITHA GARDIO

Autobiography (Cardboard-bound)	3.00
— (Paper-bound)	2.00
— (Abridged)	2.00
— (School)	1.50
Address Objections in Assam	1.00
Bapu's Letters to Ashram Sisters	1.50
Bapu's Letters to Hita	4.00
Basic Education	1.00
Communal Unity	.50
Christmas Message	2.00
Conscience Programme	6.50
Datta Ganga	1.00
Don't Deny Reform	2.00
Drink, Drugs and Gambling	2.00
Economic & Industrial Life & Relations—3 Vols	3.00
Food Shortage and Agriculture	2.00
From Varanasi to Madras	0.15
Gandhi Anthology I & II	1.00
Gandhi's correspondence with Government (1942-44)	2.00
Hind Swaraj	0.50
Hind and English in the South	4.00
Hind Dharma	4.00
How to Save the Cow	1.25
Key to Health	0.50
Khadi	1.00
Letters to Sardar Vallabhbhai	2.00
My Religion	2.00
Medium of Instruction	0.25
Non-violence in Peace and War Vol. I & II	12.00
Ramkrishna	0.45
Rebuking Our Willing	1.50
Removal of Untouchability	3.00
Satyagraha	4.00
Satyagraha in South Africa	4.00
Selections from Gandhi	2.00
Self-reliance Vs Self-indulgence	2.00
Thoughts on National Language	3.00
Towards New Education	1.00
Towards Non-violent Socialism	1.00
Truth is God	1.00
Women & Social Injustice	2.00
Wishes My Political Gans	0.50
My Dear Child	1.50
To The Students	3.00
To Students	2.00
Unes Than I am	0.50

LATEST PUBLICATIONS

Nel Gungahar Titik	1.00
A Philosophy of Indian	
Economic Development	2.50
A Shantiniketan Pilgrimage	0.40
Women	1.00
Evil Wrought by English Modern	0.25
Mind of Mahatma Gandhi	4.00
Homage to the Expatriate	2.50
Index of My Dreams	2.50
Mahatma Mohi	1.00
Ranchayat Raj	0.20
Birth Control—The Right	
Way and the Wrong Way	0.50
The Long Road	2.00

LATEST RECENTS

Cost Per Cent Sweden	1.50
Sarvodaya (Welfare of all)	2.00
Banwala	0.40
Canadian Ethos	0.75
Satyagraha in Champaran	2.25
The Story of Bardoli	3.00
Bhoolokan Yogini	0.57
A Vision of Future India	0.75
Why Partition?	0.50
An Alliance with Gandhi	0.75

OTHER HIGHLIGHTS

The Story of Mahadev Devai	1.00
Gita According to Gandhi (Cardboard-bound)	4.00
Gita According to Gandhi (Paper-bound)	1.00
A Compass for Civilization	1.00
Which Way Lay Hope?	2.00
Story Glimpses of Bapu	2.00
Gandhi & More	1.00
J.C. Karamsingh	.75
Fiction & Precepts of Jesus	1.50
Picturage for Peace	5.00
Sardar Vallabhbhai Vol. I	6.00
" " " "	1.00
Our Language Problem	2.50
Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi	4.00
As the Port of Bapu	4.00
Mrs. Chittambhai with Gandhiji	1.00

Downloaded At: 11:53 11 September 2009

Full Compliance of Public entities will be sent on demand.

1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 26

MAHATMA GANDHI—THE LAST PHASE 307 1471

1. *Chelonia mydas* (loggerhead sea turtle) – last stage of Clonidine's life

Price each Vol. \$4.50. Postage Vol. I \$1.00, Vol. II \$1.50.

NAVAJIAN TRUST

Connaught Circus, New Delhi 110 004
Bhawan, Dabholkar Marg, Bombay, Amaladevi Park, Larkow, Ground
Mira Road, Powai-4, Yashwantrao Chavan, Sector-41, Eden Hospital Road,
Colaba-17 22/111, Marine Road, Malabar-1, Chanda Bazar, Jodhpur,
P. O. MUMBAI, JAMNABHAR.

Some Articles Of Interest From Back Numbers Of Gandhi Marg

April 1957

R.C. Zacher
Bharatan Ramaswami
Wilfred Welbeck

Religions and the Challenge of Materialism
The Roots of Gandhi's Religion
Why Village Republics?

July 1957

John S. Heyland
W.E.B. Du Bois
Lord Birdwood

Mahatma Gandhi and the War on War
Gandhi and the American Negroes
Gandhi and Communism—a Speculation

October 1957

R. R. Dikakar
S.G. Bhare
P.T. Raju

Gandhian Non-violence : a Landmark
Satyagraha and Democracy
The Four Basic Principles of Gandhi's Philosophy

January 1958

S. Radhakrishnan
U.N. Dikkar
Gyan Chand

A Divided Inheritance
Bhutan and the Socialist Pattern of Society
Bhutan as a Social Revolution

April 1958

V.M. Bedekar
Homer A. Jack
Richard B. Gregg

Ahimsa in the Mahabharata—and Gandhi
Gandhi and the Communists
A Peasant's Five-Year Plan

July 1958

B. Nathani
J. Vijayabanga
B.G. Gokhale

Gandhi and Thoreau
Gandhi—a Man Alone
Gandhism and Socialism

October 1958

Vinoba Bhave
Reginald Reynolds
Ernest Wynne-Tyson

The Steadfast Wisdom
Jack Heyland—an English follower of Gandhi
The True Significance of Gandhi

January 1959

George Hendrick
Harris Wolford
P. C. Gupta

Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King
Non-violence and the Law
Impact of Gandhi on Hindi Literature

April 1959

Hiren Mukerjee
Gene Sharp
N.R. Malhotra

Gandhi and the Communist Party
Britain Considers Her Weapons
Whether Higher Education?

Copies of some of these numbers still available

G A N D H I M A R G

Rajghat New Delhi-1

Gandhi Marg

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF GANDHIAN THOUGHT

*There is no such thing as Gandhism
and I do not want to leave any sect after me.*

VOLUME THREE NUMBER FOUR OCTOBER 1999

GANDHI SMARAK NIDHI

Former Chairmen

Dr Rajendra Prasad
Sri. G.V. Mavalankar
Sri. B.G. Kher

Present Board of Trustees

Chairman Sri R. R. Dhwakar
Vice-Chairman Smt. Sacheta Kripalani

Members

Sri. Jawaharlal Nehru	Dr Gopichand Bhargava
Sri. C. Rajagopalachari	Smt. Yashodhara Dasappa
Sri. G. Ballesh Pant	Smt. A. Arpanayakam
Sri. Jagjivan Ram	Dr Prafulla Chandra Ghosh
Rajkumari Amrit Kaur	Dr Zakir Husain
Acharya J.B. Kripalani	Sri. U. N. Dhebar
Sri. Jhanspur R. D. Tata	Sri. Vankarath L. Mehta
Sri. G. D. Birla	Sri. Morarji Desai
Sri. Kasturibhai Lalbhai	Sri. Kamal Nayyar Bajaj
Lala Shri Ram	Smt. Laxmi Behn Gandhi
Mr A. P. Borthall	

Executive Committee

Chairman Sri R. R. Dhwakar
Vice-Chairman Smt. Sacheta Kripalani

Members

Sri. Jawaharlal Nehru	Sri. U.N. Dhebar
Lala Shri Ram	Sri. Morarji Desai
Acharya J. B. Kripalani	Sri. A. W. Sahastrabudhe
Smt. Laxmi Behn Gandhi	Sri. Sadiq Ali
Rajkumari Amrit Kaur	Sri. B. S. Murthy
Smt. Yashodhara Dasappa	

Secretary Sri. G. Ramachandran

Holding Trustees

Sri. G.D. Birla, Chairman
Sri. Kasturibhai Lalbhai, Vice-Chairman
Sri. J.R.D. Tata
Lala Shri Ram
Smt. Sacheta Kripalani
Sri. Morarji Desai

Central Office : near Rajghat, New Delhi.

Gandhi Marg

Editor

G. RAMACHANDRAN

VOLUME THREE

NUMBER FOUR

OCTOBER 1988

GANDHI SMARAK NIDHI

RAJGHAT NEW DELHI

EDITORIAL BOARD

R. K. DITWAKAR

J. B. KRIPALANI

JAIRAMDAS DOULATRAM

SHRIMAN NARAYAN

SADIQ ALI

G. RAMACHANDRAN

PUBLISHER

T. K. MAHADEVAN

Rs 3.00 a year in South Asia; 10s. or \$2.00 elsewhere; postage.
Rs 1.50 (Rs. or 75s.) the copy. Payment in advance.

*Published by T.K. Mahadevan for the Gandhi Smarak Niket, Rajghat, New Delhi, and
printed by him at the Namahani Press Private Limited (Successors of Azad Press) Delhi.*

Contents

	<i>Editorial Notes</i>
Vinoba Bhave	<i>The Steadfast Wisdom</i> 241
R. R. Dhwakar	<i>Democracy and Non-Violence</i> 246
J. B. Kripalani	<i>Civil Disobedience</i> 251
Horace Alexander	<i>Nuclear Explosions and World Peace</i> 261
Gene Sharp	<i>A Study of the Meanings of Non-Violence</i> 265
Bhishader Dassi	<i>A Hymn from Tukaram</i> 274
	<i>Two letters from Gandhi to Richard Gregg</i> 275
Robin Dave	<i>Gandhi and the Praja Socialist Party</i> 282
Homer A. Jack	<i>Henry S. L. Polak</i> 289
B. Natesan	<i>Thoughts on Lincoln and Gandhi</i> 293
Thomas Roberts	<i>Christian Comment on Gandhi</i> 299
Camille Desmet	<i>Gandhi in France</i> 302
Marie B. Byline	<i>Boundless Love and Natural Law</i> 308
	<i>Letters to the Editor</i> 312

Contributors to this Number

Herman Alexander: An eminent English Quaker and a close associate of Gandhi; founder of the Fellowship of Friends of Truth and chief organizer of the World Pacifist Meeting, 1949-50; has written before in *Gandhi Marg*.

Vinod Bhave: The present contribution is the fifth chapter of his forthcoming book on the concept of *atmagriha* elaborated in the Second Chapter of the *Shugand-Gita*. The earlier parts appeared in *Gandhi-Marg*, October 1958 and January, April and July 1959. The translation from the original Hindi is by Lila Rây.

Marx B. Byles: An Australian admirer of Gandhi; author of *Footprints of Gandhism The Buddha*, has written before in *Gandhi Marg*.

Robert Dave, Socialist Member of Parliament and Editor of *Janak*, a democratic socialist weekly published from Bombay, his present contribution is the third article in the series 'Gandhi and the Political Parties of India', the earlier articles of which appeared in *Gandhi-Marg*, April and July 1959.

R. R. Dvaidkar Chairman of the Gandhi National Memorial Fund and of the Gandhi Peace Foundation; former Governor of Bihar; author of many books on Gandhian thought and veteran Kannada journalist.

Camille Drevet General Secretary of the Friends of Gandhi, an

association founded by Louise Gustave soon after Gandhi's visit to France in 1932; an enthusiastic European protagonist of the Gandhian way of life and a close friend of India.

Homer A. Jack: American writer and editor of the anthology, *The Gandhi Reader* (1956); writes on a variety of subjects connected with Gandhian thought; has written before in *Gandhi Marg*.

J. B. Kripalani: One of the early associates of Gandhi; General Secretary of the Indian National Congress, 1934-46, and its President, 1946-47; now a leading Socialist Member of Parliament; author of many books on Gandhian thought, founder of *Vigil*, an independent political weekly.

B. Natanson: Formerly of *Indian Review*; frequent writer and reviewer in *Gandhi-Marg*.

Thomas Roberts. Formerly Archbishop of Bombay, now teaches in Gonzaga University; this is his first contribution to *Gandhi-Marg*.

Osse Sharp: Former Assistant Editor of *Peace News*; now doing comprehensive research on non-violence in the Institute for Social Research, Oslo; author of several studies of Gandhi and non-violence; his present contribution is the first of a four-part article which will be published in consecutive issues of *Gandhi-Marg*.

Editorial Notes

The Gandhi Peace Foundation

The Constitution of the Gandhi Peace Foundation was published in the previous issue of this Journal. Since then, some important steps have been taken to go forward with the work of the Foundation.

In accordance with Article 3 of the Constitution, the Chairman of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi has set up a Governing Body for the Gandhi Peace Foundation. The Governing Body has in turn appointed an Executive Committee to carry on the day-to-day work of the Foundation. It has also formed a small Council for Study and Research.

The composition of these three important limbs of the Foundation is sure to be of interest to our readers.

The Governing Body:

Śrī. R.R. Dawlikar, *Chairman*
Dr. Rajendra Prasad
Dr. S. Radhakrishnan
Śrī. Jawaharlal Nehru
Śrī. C. Rajagopalachari
Ācārya J.B. Kripalani
Kaka Sahab Kalekar

Śrī. Motilal Das
Dr. Panthi Shrinagappa
Śrī. U.N. Dikkar
Dr. Zakir Husain
Śrī. Jayaprakash Narayan
Smt. Sucheta Kripalani
Śrī. G. Ramachandran, *Secretary*

The Executive Committee :

Śrī. R.R. Dvārkar, Chairman
Dr S. Riddhikrishnan
Śrī. Jawaharlāl Nehru
Śrī. Morarji Deśai

Ācārya J.B. Kripālakṣī
Śrī. U.N. Dhebar
Śrī. G. Rāmachandran, Secretary

The Council for Study and Research :

Śrī. R. R. Dvārkar, Chairman
Kikā Sāhā Kālikār

Ācārya J.B. Kripālakṣī
Śrī. G. Rāmachandran, Convener

The Governing Body has also passed the following budget for the period from July to December 1959 :

Administration	Rs 6,350	Building constructions	Rs 150,000
Department of Study and Research, including ten scholarships		Other items	Rs 14,600
		Total	Rs 190,000
	Rs 17,100		

It has been decided to award ten scholarships to Research Fellows, who will be selected by the Council for Study and Research. The selected scholars will stay in New Delhi and work directly under the guidance of the Council for a period of two years. Necessary funds have been sanctioned to award scholarships of Rs 150 and Rs 250 per month to unmarried and married candidates respectively. Printed application forms have been circulated to persons who have already put in their applications informally. It is proposed to build without delay a Hostel for the accommodation of Indian and foreign scholars.

Readers will no doubt notice that the Governing Body of the Gandhi Peace Foundation contains many of those who lived and worked with Gandhi, during the many stirring and significant years when the Master made history in India, and who are today in their turn rebuilding the country after a long period of painful and debilitating subjection to foreign rule. There is one omission which will strike anybody's

mind and that is the name of Maharaj Vinoba. He was very respectfully invited to become a member of the Governing Body but he expressed his inability to do so for the simple reason that he does not wish to be a member of any Governing Body of any organization or institution. But the Ghodhi Peace Foundation will always wait on him for advice and guidance, which he has promised to give.

Kerala and After

After the last general elections, there came into existence in the Kerala State, at the extreme southern tip of the Indian sub-continent, a Communist Government within the Indian Union and under the Indian Constitution. Perhaps this was the first instance in the history of the world of Communists setting up a government through the ballot box. During the last few months, there arose in Kerala a tremendous conflict between the Communist Government and very large sections of the people. The Communist Government tried to hold on to office in the teeth of overwhelming opposition from the people. The situation became very serious and after much hesitation and warring, the President of the Republic of India dismissed the Kerala Government and brought the State, temporarily, under Presidential Rule. (Fresh elections will be held within the next few months.) The Indian Parliament, by a big majority vote, ratified Presidential action.

These are external events, now known to everybody. But the story of how there came about a mighty and peaceful upsurge of the people against the Communist Government, how that Government had nearly collapsed even before the President intervened and, above all, how many deep and elemental forces came into play, is still to be understood in its fullness. It is not our purpose to analyse here the political events of this episode. What is of the utmost significance in this connection is the unique phenomenon of a people rising peacefully and successfully against a Communist Government, thus proving that if in a conflict between Communists and the people, the ring itself is not held by the Communists but by those who hold on to democratic traditions, then the people will always have a chance to win.

The Ghodhi Peace Foundation has sent to Kerala a small Study Team of scholars to look at and understand the deeper trends and motivations behind and beneath the external events in Kerala. These scholars belong to no political party and will study the situation in Kerala as a human problem affecting future developments in India.

The Study Team is expected to finish its work and furnish a report to the Gandhi Peace Foundation within the next two months. It is, therefore, just possible that either the whole of the report or relevant parts of it may appear in the pages of our next number.

'With the Kings in India'

This is the title of a brochure brought out recently by the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi as a Souvenir of the visit to India of Dr Martin Luther King, Mrs King and Dr Reddick in the months of February and March this year. These Negro leaders went round India, visiting places and institutions associated with the life and work of Mahātmā Gandhi, meeting many outstanding leaders of India and spending some time with Mahārāj Yashvāt during his walking tour in Rājasthān. They received a wonderful welcome and much affection from the people everywhere and, in their turn, left behind them a deep and abiding impression of their understanding of the techniques of non-violent action under modern conditions. *With the Kings in India* does not claim to be anything like a full report of the visit. It gives simply a few interesting glimpses of the main events of the tour, as also some fine pictures showing the Kings in various places and company, as they met people and saw institutions in many places in India.

Copies of the brochure can be had from the office of the Gandhi Peace Foundation at Rajghat, New Delhi 1.

The Steadfast Wisdom

VINDRA BHAVE

We have seen that what the Gñā tells us is different from what Māra says. It will be profitable for us to clarify the distinction further. The heart is situated midway between the mind and the senses. Who would master the senses must master the heart also. The heart is not amenable by nature. The Gñā advises us to restrain the senses first. As the senses are mastered the heart is not mastered to the same extent as a matter of course. The contrary is the case, for the senses, as they are detached from outward objects, tend to turn upwards and assail the heart. The *śākhā* knows this. He separates himself from his impulses. He knows that his feelings are being attacked. He neither surrenders nor cooperates. The language used in the Gñā makes this clear. The senses strongly assail the heart of the *śākhā* and seek to draw it after them, says the Gñā - *āvaṁ parābhavaṁ manah*. The heart of the *śākhā* is swayed but not the *śākhā* himself. Māra tells us that 'the senses in their excitement sway even the sage, they draw after them not only his heart but the man himself' - *śaśāśvameva āvaṁ*. The senses turn to attack the heart as they are brought under control. A way has to be found to stop them. This is difficult even for a sage and for the *śākhā* this period of transition is a time of great danger and struggle. The impulses run after objects of sense. The *śākhā* gives them no encouragement. To check them he exerts himself to reach a state so stable that his heart will cease to be attracted by them. If all his knowledge and all his striving are of no avail what can he do? The answer is given in the verse which follows:-

*Tīkṣa sarveṣa saṁjanyā yuktis dīṇa matparah,
Pāte hi yaya indriyāṇa taya prapīḍa pautyāṇā.*

'*Tīkṣa sarveṣa saṁjanyā matparah dīṇa*' is to be construed thus: '*yuktaḥ saṁ tīkṣa sarveṣa saṁjanyā matparah dīṇa*'. Control all your

screen judiciously and consecrate yourself to God. The senses can and must be mastered with knowledge and perseverance. The necessity and the urgency of controlling them must be realised. Trust to the way of self-control in order to do it. Control and expression are both contained in one word—*abroddha*, restraint. The Gñd says that knowledge and perseverance give us the strength required to restrain the senses. But even after one has gained control over the senses by these rather crude means, his mastery is not secure until he has likewise won control over his emotional impulses. Human strength is not equal to the task of mastering the human heart. Here comes in faith, *bhakti*.

When a man reaches the limit of his human powers, hesitates and thinks of abandoning the field of battle, the need for faith becomes acute. Faith only finds entrance where effort is unflinching and exertion untraced. Our human powers, the powers that God has given us, find their last and supreme expression in faith and humility, culminating in these two virtues. The strength in us is the divine strength of Kṛpā, the strength of God. He bestows it upon us at the beginning, giving us a part and retaining a part as reserve. We mistake this God-given power for our own. It is not ours but God's. And the part that God holds in reserve for us belongs, conversely, to us and is ours. When we have fully utilised the share given us at the start, spending it cravely, we win the right to ask for the remainder.

If we do not utilise to their full extent the powers that we have, how can God give us the remainder? A father gives his son ten thousand rupees to start a business. If the son does not make use of the ten thousand why should his father give him a lakh more? When his father finds that the ten thousand has been used to the best purpose he says, 'The rest is yours!' Our relationship with God is similar. He is prepared to give us the strength He holds in reserve for us. All that He requires is proof of the urgency of our need. God is gratified when a person is able to show that he has used up all his own resources and requires more. 'This is the kind of enterprising devotee I like', He says. Never yet in the world, however, has there been a task to accomplish which the whole of God's strength has been needed. Man easily obtains from God as much strength as he needs and is able to use well. A time never comes when a man can despair or surrender. When he has used to the full all the powers he has been given he will receive more and greater ones. Why should God give him more powers if he asks God for them before he has used what he has to their full extent? God does not need to make a show of His work. What of His handiwork is still unfinished? His Creation is complete. He is eager to add

to your glory, to your achievement. Keep on trying, applying all your powers to your chosen task. When you find that you can do no more by your own effort turn to God. He will give you the additional powers you need.

In discussions of the *Shikhi mitzvot* or the way of faith, it is the custom to cite the example of an elephant. The story is of an elephant which tried to conquer by its own strength alone and God therefore refrained from coming to its assistance. The elephant was proud of its strength and because of its pride God could not help it and its pride was destroyed. This is but right. Imagine an elephant that is not proud of its strength and imagines, further, that it prays to God for assistance constantly while refusing to do anything to help itself. This refusal is a kind of inverse pride. Why should it not do what it can with the powers that it has? Are these powers its own? Not at all. They are God's. It is not pride to use the strength one has in the consciousness that this strength is God's. Not to so use it does show pride. It shows lack of faith. It shows slothfulness. You are hearing powers that are not yours and, at the same time, asking for more. Use the strength that you have, with humility, for it belongs to God, and ask for more only when you have exhausted it. If you make the fullest and best use of what you have God will give you what you have not.

Here we find, in the final analysis, dependence, dependence upon God. Some may exclaim that this is, once again, subjugation. To think so is wrong. Subjugation begins when one's own powers end. It puts an end to them if you think of this dependence as subjugation. To trust in the power of God is not to subjugate oneself. It can become subjugation only if God is thought of as a stranger. God is not a stranger. Suppose you divide a coat pocket into two halves, an inner and an outer, and put money in both halves. When the money in the outer half is spent you take money from the inner half. Both halves of the pocket are yours. Or suppose that you keep some of your money in your trunk and some in the bank. The situation is similar. God and you are two aspects of the same consciousness. You are a part. God is the whole. The consciousness of both is the same. It follows that His strength is also your strength. And so it is that to ask for and accept assistance from God is not subjugation.

Faith begins where our own efforts to master our hearts fail. Not until then does the need for it become acute. When a person can do no more by himself he grows anxious for help. Faith is born of this

anxiety. There is no anxiety until this point is reached. Therefore faith is not present. There may be trust. We control over your senses by the use of the powers that are yours. And when these senses, detached from external objects, turn to assail you inwardly, attacking your heart, ask for the help of God in combating them. To seek the help of God in such a pure and delicate task is called an act of devotion. To seek the help of God in our common daily affairs has become a habit. We mistake such ignorant behaviour for devotion. It is not so. What sort of devotion is it to pray to God for help in passing an examination? It is childishness. Unmanly. Do you ask for God's help because your crop has not been good? As if God has not given you the power to solve all such problems! These are not matters in which we can seek God's help. It is not seemly to seek his assistance in relation to worldly things which we desire to accomplish.

Both parties to a war pray to God for victory. God has a will of His own. It is not possible for Him to give victory to both sides. Yet I regard Him as subject to my will. I want Him to use His divine powers to bring about what I want. To make His will my will constitutes an act of devotion. I do the opposite. I want to win. I have made up my mind in advance. All I want God to do is to grant me victory. My prayer ought to be framed as follows. 'May I win if my cause is a right and just cause. If it is not, let me lose. To lose will debase me inwardly.' In the *Mahabharata* there is the following story. Queen Gandhari, out of sympathy with her blind husband, Dhritarashtra, had her eyes bound. Her son, Duryodhana, came to take his leave of her when he went to war. She blessed him, saying, 'May you win if your cause is a true and righteous cause!' Here we have a genuine prayer. Why should you pray, 'God, please restore to me what I have lost?' Your prayer should be, 'Whether what I have lost is restored to me or not, may I not lose my peace of mind!' When a child is ill people pray, 'May the child not die!' Good! But what kind of a prayer is that? All must die sooner or later; this is a known fact. If one must pray for a child's life, pray that he may be spared now and add that you do not object if he dies at some other time, say, on the 28th. Your petition to God should be as precise as that. Who prays in such a fashion? Pray that the child may be spared mental and physical suffering at the time of his death.

We make up our minds as to what is good for us in advance and then ask God to give us what we want. That is to say, we treat God as if He is the servant of our understanding. A story in the *Upanishads* relates how a certain person with whom God was pleased was tested.

"Ask a boon if the Lord said to him. The man answered, "What do I know about a boon? Do I know what is good for me? You know all things. Grant me what is good for me!" Thus was the man wiled and not found wanting. He did not try to impose his own will upon God. It is fortunate for me that God is not prepared to act as I want Him to act. And when, on occasion, He does so it is probable that He wishes to teach me the consequences of intellectual pride, of intemperance with my own will. We accept the evidence of our own understanding as conclusive and expect God also to accept it. That is to say, we regard God as a menial who is obliged to carry out our orders. We admit that He is powerful. But He is, nevertheless, our servant. We are the judges, the avengers. It is we who are the dispensers of fate and He is merely the sheriff or, say, the Sub-divisional Magistrate. The attempt to use God as an instrument of our will, a lifeless agent, is a sign of pride and it also shows rigidity. There is cynicism in this attitude to God, insolence. This element of rigidity, a certain hardening, has, in the name of faith, entered into all religions. It does not show faith to seek the help of God in accomplishing what we desire. Over and over again the God strikes out at activity inspired by desire. It is as if the God has a vendetta with such activity.

But here and there the God, moved perhaps by compassion, does say that if a person calls upon God with complete devotion his prayer may be granted although he prays out of desire. And his prayer is fulfilled. But this is exceptional. It is not the rule. One who turns to God out of passionate desire is given hope. The rule is that even one who prays for what is good must do so dispassionately. Passionate prayer is not vindicated or enforced by the above concession. What is here expressed is the feeling that it is much better for a person to turn wholly to God even though he does it out of desire. There is stupidity in passion and an apprehension of degradation. But there is scope for progress if whole-heartedness is present. It is possible to discipline the passion. If you concentrate your whole being in an ardent prayer to God your heart can be cleansed by His touch. Ordinarily people do not pray whole-heartedly when they pray for something they want. They neither believe nor disbelieve whole-heartedly. When they are ill they fall at the feet of doctors and at the same time invoke Beelzebub to recite prayers. Their faith is wavering, impotent. The weakness of man's faith sends them to perdition. Passion belongs to a lower level of existence, undoubtedly, but it becomes tolerable when whole-hearted devotion is joined to it, for passion then becomes a purifying agent. What we must really achieve is the fusion of whole-heartedness with dispassionateness.

Democracy and Non-Violence

R. L. DHAWAKAR

These two words, 'democracy' and 'non-violence', are very important for India and the world today more than at any other time in history. Both the concepts and the words are ancient, almost as ancient as human society itself. They are words which are very potent and pregnant with meaning and their close interrelation holds perhaps the key to the future peaceful progress of human civilization.

Words may be said to have their own life and evolution too, like all living things. Democracy and non-violence are words which are still evolving and gathering meaning as humanity goes on practising them. Their outer forms remain, but their connotation and significance for us increase and develop with the progress of human history.

Taken separately, these words have very long histories of their own behind them. Both have philologies, and almost metaphysics, of their own. Their study is very fascinating, interesting and useful to students of human relations, of sociology and psycho-social development. But within the space of this brief article one would rather like to deal only with the practical and common-sense aspects of these words, in the context of and as applicable to present-day problems, although even these require a certain amount of probing into their deeper meaning and interrelation. Before I do so, however, I should like to emphasize that both democracy and non-violence are but means; the end, so far as human society is concerned, is obviously to attain and establish a universal community of human beings which shall be peaceful, happy and progressive in the physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual fields and which shall give, at the same time, full and free scope to each man and woman to attain the highest of which he or she is capable.

* Summarized from an address given at the Harold Laski Institute, Ahmedabad, on 14 June 1959.

Though I have emphasised that these are only means, I may nevertheless make bold to say that a harmonious synthesis of democracy and non-violence is such a potent means that it answers to the dictum that 'means are ends'. If we pursue these means, the ends will be seen to be already involved in them.

The word 'democracy' and the concept it stands for are very old. It is a mistake to think that it is only a Western concept. What is Western in the concept, as it obtains today, is the particular interpretation and the form it has attained by experimentation and evolution. But this form cannot be said to be either the best form or the final form or the only form. Democracies and republics, like that of the *Vijaya* at the time of the Buddha (sixth century B.C.) were working in India centuries before Christ and probably some of them were earlier than the Greek republics. There are references to republics even in the *Atharva Veda* (e.g. the *Sabha* and the *Samiti*). Village Communities run on democratic principles were common in Russia (e.g. the *mir*). In India, the ancient *panchayat* system is still alive in the villages, although it has lost its prestige, purity and republican vigour. It will thus be seen that the word and concept of democracy are not exclusively Western nor are they the monopoly of the West. Respect for collective wisdom has been a common feature of normal human groups everywhere in the world.

It may seem rather strange to us at this distance of time that democracy was once not a very respectable thing in the West. It was equated almost with mob-rule. That was, perhaps, why Aristotle belittled it and Plato attacked it. In comparatively modern times, there was a difference of opinion about its use between Jefferson and Adams. The American Founding Fathers were especially afraid of the word and they used the expression 'Republican Principles'. Alexander Hamilton has gone to the extent of saying that even the well-behaved and orderly democracy of Athens had not 'one good feature of good government'. Later a distinction was made between 'democracy', which meant direct rule by the people, and 'republic', which meant rule through representatives. Before we arrive at the classic definition of democracy by Abraham Lincoln in 1863, we had similar definitions by Cooper in 1793 and by Theodore Parker in 1830. But many things have happened since Lincoln declared at Gettysburg that democracy is the government of the people, by the people and for the people.

Democracy is no longer restricted to the domain of politics and political institutions. It is a system, a way of life, which gives the

highest importance to individual freedom and individual initiative. It believes in the inherent capacity of the human spirit to grow, in the inherent right of the human spirit to progress in an atmosphere of freedom and of full scope. It is as comprehensive as life itself and believes that all social activities should be organised on a democratic basis—on willing cooperation, collective thinking, and majority decision.

In essence, democracy is decision by discussion, action according to majority decision, and implicit in it is freedom to individuals and groups to convert the majority to their own view by every peaceful and moral means but never by violence and force, open or implied. This naturally involves what are called the fundamental rights and free access to the instruments of persuasion and their full and free use. It is here that the proper working of the principle of democracy in any field demands the observance of non-violence, of ahimsa, as the basic rule of conduct between individual and individual, group and group, and between majorities and minorities. It has been the constant endeavour of democracy to substitute reason for blind force, persuasion for coercion and moral means for immoral ones. Conflict of interests there will always be, but the key to their best and constructive solution, with the highest advantage to all concerned, can only be through reason, through non-violence, through friendly approach and mutual understanding, and never, never, through measuring of physical strength, through the use of deceit and destruction and through any violent means.

It is obvious that democracy without non-violence as its mode of operation will have no future and will collapse like a structure which has no firm foundation. It may also be noted that the principle of democracy is now in demand in international affairs too, in all activities which are of a global nature. It is no longer only non-national. The many inter-national bodies, such as the U.N.O. and its agencies, have to adopt democratic ways, partially or fully, in the conduct of their business. If there is going to be a world government some day, it will have to be a democracy based on non-violent conduct between member states.

Thus the future of democracy is far greater than its past and there seems to be no rational alternative to it if men and nations are to rise to their full stature with equal freedom and equal opportunities to all.

Before I go to non-violence and its significance, it may be refreshing to know how the Buddha, the apostle of peace and non-violence, upheld the principle of democracy and pin-pointed the essence

of democratic functioning. It is well known that he learnt much from the republics of the day around him and adopted for his religious organisation a number of features from them. The republics, especially those of the Vrijja and the Licchavis, were full-fledged democracies with elections, assemblies, rules of procedure, voting by ballot and so on. Once on being asked by one of his closest disciples as to the strength and continuity of the republics, he is reported to have said as follows :

And the Blessed One said to him : 'Have you heard, Ānanda, that the Vrijjans¹ hold full and frequent public assemblies ?'

'Lord, so I have heard', replied he.

'So long, Ānanda', rejoined the Blessed One, 'as the Vrijjans hold these full and frequent public assemblies, so long may they be expected not to decline, but to prosper'.

And in the like manner questioning Ānanda, and receiving a similar reply, the Blessed One declared as follows the other conditions which would ensure the welfare of the Vrijjan confederacy :

'So long, Ānanda, as the Vrijjans meet together in concord, and rise in concord, and carry out their undertakings in concord ; so long as they enact nothing not already established (by reason), abrogate nothing that has been already enacted, and act in accordance with the ancient institutions of the Vrijjans as established in former days ; so long as they honour and esteem and revere and support the Vrijjan elders, and deem it a point of duty to hearken to their words ; so long as no women or girls belonging to their class are detained among them by force or abduction ; so long as they honour and esteem and revere and support the Vrijjan shrines in town or country, and allow not the proper offerings and rites, as formerly given and performed, to fall into desuetude ; so long as the rightful protection, defence, and support shall be fully provided for the *avastis* among them, so that *avastis* from a distance may enter the realm, and the *avastis* therein may live at ease—so long may the Vrijjans be expected not to decline, but to prosper.'

If a friendly approach, solution of conflicts by mutual adjustment, decisions by discussion are some of the fundamentals of democracy, it is imperative that an atmosphere of violence, of non-violence, of non-fear ought to prevail. In an atmosphere of violence, or mutual fear

1. A confederacy of republics in Vajjīh.

and distrust, no discussions worth the name can be carried on and no democracy can function effectively and continuously. A non-violent atmosphere is the basic requirement of a functioning democracy.

It is in this context that we should try to find out the true meaning of non-violence. Though the word non-violence—*ahimsa*—is negative in form, it is really very positive in content. It means love, mutual trust, willingness to discuss and decide by discussion, readiness to cooperate and adjust and so on. Long long ago when an atmosphere of violence may have prevailed in early prehistoric societies, the then wise men must have asked people to cease to be violent, to become non-violent. But since then, the word has gathered meanings which have enriched it to such an extent that today it is the basic principle of any human society, be it only of two persons. Even a single family cannot be built up if there is not an atmosphere of non-violence, of mutual love and trust.

In the early days, non-violence began to be preached and practised as an individual virtue. But it was soon found that without its adoption on a wider scale, however temporary or superficial it might be in different cases, no co-operation or collective effort was possible and no peace or harmony could be established. From an individual attainment it thus developed into a social economy, and as human groups became larger and larger, non-violence became a *rita* and *satya*. It is now an inseparable companion of democracy wherever it may function, whether in a club, in a social institution or in a big republic like that of India or the United States. A non-violent atmosphere is a condition precedent for any success or progress or prosperity worth the name in any organisation, national or international.

But it was left to the genius of the Mahatma to raise non-violence, *ahimsa*, to the dignity of the most noble and practical weapon of resistance to all evil and injustice, whether it be between man and man or nation and nation, and whether it is in the economic field or in the social or political field. Like democracy, it is a way of life. It is based on the realisation that all life is one and on the faith that hatred begets hatred and love alone conquers hatred and engenders love. While democracy relies on non-violence for its functioning, progress and fulfilment, non-violence calls upon its votaries to use only democratic methods and to rely on the power of love to persuade and convert the opponents. But be it remembered forever that both democracy and non-violence reinforced by each other must subserve the cause of truth, if they are to be effective and successful. Otherwise they build on sand, for nothing based on untruth can survive or prosper.

Civil Disobedience

J. B. KRIPALANI

There has been a good deal of discussion in public and the press about the place of civil disobedience, *satyagraha*, in a democracy. That this weapon should not be used in India any more against a government put in power democratically by the popular vote has been the contention of the Congress governments. This limitation to *satyagraha* has not been accepted by the opposition parties, including the Communist Party before it came to power in Kerala. During their rule in Kerala the Communists too advanced the Congress plea that civil disobedience against a democratically elected government was neither right nor proper nor legally or constitutionally justified. It will, therefore, be worth while to study Gandhi's views on the subject. After all it was he who conceived the idea and developed the technique of this non-violent method of fighting injustice and redressing wrongs.

Gandhi has never once, in his copious writings on the subject, said that civil disobedience cannot be resorted to against a democratically formed government. It would be strange if he had. Gandhi never believed that the majority opinion must always be right. He assigned the supreme place to the individual conscience. But he did not consider it infallible. He therefore put on it the restraint of non-violence. If individuals and groups do not use violence, or coercion, and are prepared willingly to suffer the legal and other consequences of breaking the law, they are entitled to do so for what they consider to be right. But who is to decide what is right? Here is Gandhi's cryptic answer:

Questioner: 'However honestly a man may strive in his search for truth, his notion of truth may be different from that of others. Who then is to determine the truth?'

Gandhi: 'The individual himself.'

Questioner: 'But honest striving after truth is different in every case.'

Gandhi: 'That is why the non-violence part of it.'

Gandhi was conscious of the fact that any system of government, foreign or indigenous, democratic or totalitarian, may go wrong. He knew that even under democratic forms a government may be autocratic, that is, it may be highly centralized or corrupt. In such cases it would trample on the individual's liberty and freedom. Under such circumstances, Gandhi proclaimed the supremacy of the individual conscience, provided that the individual was willing to suffer the consequences of bearing witness to the truth in him. Gandhi also held that it is thus that the world has progressed. He says: 'When Daniel disregarded the Laws of the Medes and Persians which offended his conscience and meekly suffered the punishment for his disobedience, he offered *satyagraha*. Socrates would not refrain from preaching what he knew to be the truth and bravely suffered death. Daniel and Socrates are regarded as having been model citizens of the states to which they belonged.' Further Gandhi considered *satyagraha* as a pure and true weapon. He says, 'I believe that the use of a pure weapon even from a mistaken motive does not fail to produce some good.' Also, that 'to put down civil resistance is to imperil the conscience'.

Can civil disobedience be offered against a democratic government? The answer would be in the negative if no occasion could ever arise for a democratic government to offend an individual's conscience or to be corrupt. This would manifestly be unhistorical and not true to the facts of life. However, Gandhi's answer is clear. He says 'I hold non-cooperation is of universal use. Well applied, its use in politics can displace the use of barbarous weapons of mutual destruction. The thing, therefore, to be done is not to restrict its use but to extend it. The risk of misuse has undoubtedly to be run.' But then Gandhi held that 'no big or vast movement can be carried on without bold risks and life will not be worth living if it is not attended with large risks'. When, therefore, occasion demanded he did not hesitate to take grave risks for himself and for the nation he led and guided. His whole life was full of risks.

Gandhi however says that in a well-ordered state the occasions for civil resistance would be rare. He says 'It is rarely that the occasion for civil resistance rises in a well-ordered state. But when it does, it becomes a duty that cannot be shirked by one who counts his honour, i. e. his conscience, above everything.'

Unfortunately today there are all manner of democracies in various stages of development and under-development. A government may be installed in power by the free popular vote, but it may take steps to entrench itself in power permanently. Even if it retains the paraphernalia of the vote and periodical elections, it may be totalitarian in character. We have the examples of the Nazi and communist regimes. In India the anti-state Communist government in Kerala has been charged with trying to destroy democracy, after it had come to power through the democratic vote. Gandhi, therefore, does not talk of democracy but, what is more unambiguous, of a well-ordered state; and here, too, he holds that civil disobedience may become a duty for a conscientious citizen.

To further clarify his point Gandhi says: 'I wish I could persuade everybody that civil resistance is the inherent right of a citizen. He does not give it up without ceasing to be a man.' The word 'citizen' in this context is significant. Only in a democracy is a man a citizen. In a totalitarian regime there are no citizens but only subjects and slaves.

Gandhi goes so far as to say that civil disobedience is the birth-right of the citizen. He holds: 'It is possible to question the wisdom of applying civil disobedience in respect of a particular act or law; it is possible to advise delay and caution. But the right itself cannot be allowed to be questioned. It is a birthright that cannot be surrendered without surrender of one's self-respect.'

Gandhi further holds: 'Civil disobedience becomes a sacred duty when the state becomes lawless or, which is the same thing, corrupt; and a citizen who barters with such a state shares its corruption and lawlessness'.

Again Gandhi says: 'Civil disobedience can be made a sovereign remedy for all our ills if we can produce the necessary atmosphere for it. For individuals there is always that atmosphere, except when their civil disobedience leads to bloodshed. . . . Even so a call may come which one dare not neglect, cost what it may. When the neglect of the call means a denial of God, civil disobedience becomes a presumptory duty.'

'When a government goes wrong to the extent of hurting the national fibre itself, it becomes the right of the subject, indeed it is his duty, to withdraw his obedience to the extent it may be required in order to bend the government to the national will.'

Gandhi held that no tyranny in the world could carry on without

the active or passive coöperation of its victims. If they are brave and fearless enough to withstand the demands of tyranny and withdraw their coöperation, tyranny would collapse. He therefore held that the remedy lay with the oppressed. Thus the movement of *satyagraha*, as conceived by him, was one of self-purification. He held that all reform must begin with oneself. He says - 'You assist an administration most effectively by obeying its orders and decrees. An evil administration never deserves such allegiance. A good man will therefore resist an evil system or administration with his whole soul. . . . Civil disobedience is the only and the most successful remedy and is obligatory upon him who would disassociate himself from evil' (*italics mine*).

Gandhi was most careful in using words. He not only talks of a bad system of government but also of a bad administration. A good system of government may become evil because of bad and corrupt administration. Even democracy may be badly administered. The present controversies in India between different political parties do not centre on the democratic ideal, which all accept, but on how the system is being administered, by the Communist Party till recently in Kerala and by the Congress elsewhere.

Gandhi further held that *satyagraha*, to be genuine, may be offered against one's wife or one's children, against rulers, against fellow citizens, even against the world. Such a universal force necessarily makes no distinction between kinsmen and strangers, young and old, man and woman, friend and foe.' No exception is made here of a government come into being democratically. In Gandhi's view any individual group or government may go wrong and, then, the sovereign remedy is civil disobedience and not coercion or violence.

When Gandhi expounded his concept of the Trusteeship of the rich, it was pointed out to him that it implied the existence of law courts, which in the last resort could compel fulfilment of the terms of the trust. Where, he was asked, was the court of justice in his Trusteeship of the rich and the capitalists. His reply was that there was none, except civil disobedience. It was civil disobedience which would compel compliance with the terms of the Trust.

It is often said that civil disobedience is not constitutional. Gandhi's emphatic view was that civil disobedience is not unconstitutional, inasmuch as the person or persons who offer civil disobedience are non-violent and are willing to pay the penalty of disobedience they are acting constitutionally.

A constitution, if it is really democratic, cannot deny to the individual the right to act according to his conscience, provided that he does so non-violently, without violating the rights of fellow citizens, and is willing to bear the consequences of his disobedience.

Gandhi goes further and holds that civil disobedience is not an illegal activity. It is not the violation of the law but the fulfilment of a higher law. Socrates violated the law inasmuch as he refused to refrain from preaching to the young and arguing with them. He again violated the law when he refused to pay the fine for what he considered a lawful activity. He refused to accept the judgement of constituted authority so far as his guilt was concerned. But he did not refuse to bear the consequences of his disobedience though it meant his drinking the cup of poison. He was the first martyrdom known to history. He was opposing the newly constituted democracy of Athens, after the Tyranny of the Thirty.

Was Socrates a law-abiding or a law-breaking citizen? He himself answers the question in *Crito*.

His friend, Crito, advised secret flight from jail before the cup of poison was administered. To him Socrates replies, "Consider the matter this way. Imagine that I am about to play trust . . . and the laws and the government come and interrogate me. "Tell us, Socrates", they say, "what are you about? Are you not going by an act of yours to overturn us—the laws and the whole state as far as in you lies? Do you imagine that a state can subsist and not be overthrown, in which the decrees of law have no power, but are set aside and trampled upon by individuals?" What will be our answer, Crito, to these and the like words? . . . Shall we reply, "Yes, but the state has injured us and given an unjust sentence?" . . .

"And was that our agreement with you?" the law would answer, "or were you to abide by the sentence of the state?" And if I were to express my astonishment at their words, the law would probably add: "Answer, Socrates. . . Tell us—what complaint have you to make against us which justifies you in attempting to destroy us and the state? In the first place, did we not bring you into existence? . . . Say whether you have any objection to urge against those of us . . . who after birth regulate the nurture and education of children, in which you also were trained? . . . Well, then, since you were brought into the world and nurtured and educated by us, can you deny in the first place that you are our child and slave? . . . And if this is true you are not on equal terms with us, nor

can you think that you have a right to . . . destroy us in return, and your country as far as in you lies . . ." What answer shall we make to this, Crito? Do the laws speak truly or do they not? To this Crito replies in the affirmative.

Further Socrates points out to Crito that the laws would argue that by remaining in the city for seventy years and not leaving it and having experience of the manner in which justice is administered in the state he has entered into an implied contract that he will do as they command him. "Moreover, you might in the course of the trial, if you had liked, have faced the penalty at banishment, the state which refuses to let you go now would have let you go then. But you pretended that you preferred death to exile . . . And now you have forgotten these fine sentiments and pay no respect to us, the laws, of whom you are the destroyer. . . . You, Socrates, are breaking the covenants and agreements which you made with us at your leisure. In your old age you will not be ashamed to violate the most sacred laws from a miserable desire of a little more life. Listen then to us and not to Crito."

Socrates concludes: "This, dear Crito, is the voice which I seem to have been hearing in my ears, like the sound of the flute in the ears of the mystic. I know that anything more you may say will be in vain. . . . Leave me then to fulfil the will of God and to follow whither He leads."

This, in brief, is the position that Socrates takes. He breaks the law and yet says he is the slave of the laws. All the benefits he and his children had enjoyed have been under the protection of the laws. He also admits that between him and the laws there is an implied contract of subordination and not of equality by virtue of his continued residence in the city and accepting its benefits. Is there not a clear contradiction between the two positions enunciated by Socrates, of disobeying the law and being subservient to it? Socrates seems to find no contradiction. It is only an apparent contradiction. In fact when Socrates seems to break the law he thinks that in reality he is not breaking the law, because he does so under three limitations: (1) he obeys a higher law, that of his conscience, which a good constitution must respect even though it may be obliged to punish violation of the law, (2) the law is broken non-violently; and (3) the violator is prepared to pay the full penalty of violation willingly and cheerfully.

Socrates in his defence, in the *Apology*, shows that he is a good and patriotic citizen of the state. He says: "Men of Athens, I honour and love you both. I shall obey God rather than you and while I have life I shall

never cease from the presence and teaching of philosophy.' He also recounts the services he has faithfully rendered to the state, and on several occasions at the peril of his life. He is a good citizen who not only obeys the laws but respects his fellow citizens. Such a one, even while breaking a law, is in reality not breaking the law, but fulfilling it in a higher and nobler sense.

In *Crito*, the laws do not take Socrates to task for violating them when he refused to obey his judges and refrain from preaching to the young. Again they, the laws, do not blame him for refusing to pay the fine imposed upon him. They would blame him only if he followed the advice of his friend, Crito, and escaped from jail. The first two cases of disobedience are civil, because for them he is willing to pay the penalty imposed by the lawful authority. Leaving the jail surreptitiously would be criminal disobedience, because he would not be prepared to suffer willingly the penalty attached to absconding. If he were he would leave the jail openly and in daylight. Nay, if not seen he would attract the attention of the jail wardens to his act of leaving their custody. If he did this there would be no point in absconding for he will not be allowed to do so but will get the added punishment for trying to abscond, which is against the law. That was not what Crito had advised. He had advised deceiving the authorities and gaining freedom. That is not civil but criminal disobedience. As such it will injure the laws and the state.

The same point is made clear in the life of Christ. When the authorities of the temple accused him of breaking the Jewish laws he declared that he had come 'not to destroy but to fulfil the law'. He could say this even when he was violating any number of laws and conventions prescribed by the heads of the Jewish religion. Jesus, it seems, saw no contradiction in his mission of fulfilling the law and breaking many of the prescribed laws of his religion. Sometimes the law in its spirit and essence can be fulfilled only when its external regulations are violated. The law is thus transcended. It can be transcended when its scope is extended to bring out its essence more effectively. This was possible not by adhering to the letter of the law but by violating it. 'The letter killeth but the spirit saveth.'

In modern times Thoreau, Emerson and Tolstoy have advocated civil disobedience to vindicate the right of the individual conscience. Thoreau in his *Essay on Civil Disobedience* says: 'Must the citizen ever for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every man a conscience then? I think we should be men first, and subjects afterwards. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for law, so much as for the right. . . . It is truly enough said, that a corporation has no conscience.' Further he says: 'All men recognize the right of a dissent

to refuse obedience to and to resist the Government when its tyranny and inefficiency are great and unendurable."

One of Thoreau's sayings has become a classic: 'Under a Government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison.'

However Thoreau, Emerson and Tolstoy thought generally of the right of individuals to civil disobedience. The latter two had no occasion, as Thoreau had, of putting their theory into practice. Thoreau also had occasion to offer civil resistance only once in his life. Gandhi contemplated not only individual but collective civil disobedience for the redress of political, social and economic wrongs. He organised in his lifetime many collective movements in pursuance of his technique of civil disobedience. In the process he systematised it. Let us then see what Gandhi has to say about civil disobedience or *satyagraha*, as he called it.

On this aspect of breaking the laws, Gandhi says: 'Civil disobedience presupposes a scrupulous observance of all laws which do not hurt the moral sense. . . . Thoughtless disobedience means disruption of the state. The first thing, therefore, for those who aspire after civil disobedience is to learn the art of willingly obeying the state laws, whether they like them or not. Civil disobedience is not a state of lawlessness, but presupposes a law-abiding spirit, combined with self-restraint.'

'Only when a citizen has disciplined himself in the art of voluntary obedience to the state laws is he justified on rare occasions deliberately but non-violently to disobey them and expose himself to the penalty of the breach.'

'I have found that it is our first duty to render voluntary obedience to law, but whilst doing that duty I have also seen that when law fosters untruth, it becomes a duty to disobey it. We can do so by never swerving from truth and suffering the consequences of our disobedience.'

'The use of civil disobedience will be healthy, necessary and effective only if we otherwise conform to the laws of all growth. Civil disobedience is a beautiful variant to signify growth; it is not discordance, which spells death' (*satyagraha*).

'Before one can be fit for the practice of civil disobedience, one must have rendered a willing and respectful obedience to the state laws. A *satyagrahi* obeys the laws of society intelligently and of his own free will, because he considers it his sacred duty to do so. It is only when a person has thus obeyed the laws of society scrupulously, that he is in a

position to judge as to which particular rules are good and just and which unjust and unjust. Only then does the right accrue to him of the civil disobedience of certain laws in well-defined circumstances."

'A satyagrahi is nothing if not instinctively law-abiding, and it is his law-abiding nature which exacts from him implicit obedience to the highest law, that is, the voice of his conscience. Every law given the subject an opportunity to obey the primary sanction or the secondary, and I venture to suggest that the satyagrahi by inviting secondary sanction obeys *the law*. He does not act like the ordinary offender, who not only commits a breach of the laws of the land, whether good or bad, but wishes to avoid the consequences of that breach' (*saties mine*).

Gandhi's view is emphatic that when one obeys the laws and is a loyal citizen and yet on occasion breaks the law because it is against his conscience and is prepared to pay the penalty provided for the breach of law willingly, he is not breaking the law.

Again Gandhi says: 'It is only when a people have proved their active loyalty by obeying the many laws of the state that they acquire the right of civil disobedience.'

'Daniel and Socrates are regarded as model citizens of the states to which they belonged, Prithida a model son, Mitrabai a model wife.' They fulfilled the law though apparently breaking it.

As a matter of fact there has never been a reformer or a prophet who has not broken laws as they existed or as prescribed by the ruling authority, be it political, social or religious. Law-making was never, as it is today, the exclusive function of the state. As a matter of fact that was its least function. Its chief function was to see that the immemorial laws or those that were customary or made by religious and social heads or organisations were observed. The political authority was further to inflict appropriate penalties for non-observance of laws not always made by itself. When a religious law or convention was broken, the priesthood decided the case and handed the name or the criminal (there was no distinction then) to the political authority. This was done in the case of Christ. The authorities of the temple adjudged Christ to be guilty and awarded him the punishment of death on the cross. The Roman governor only carried out the punishment. While carrying it out, he washed his hands clean of punishing a man in whom he saw no evil. The state in ancient times rarely made laws. The sanctions attached to the laws that existed or were made by associations, other than the state, were no less stringent than those attached to laws made by the political authority or the state. Often pey-

ethologically they were more stringent and compelling. All such laws, and those that in later days were made by the state, were broken by reformers, prophets and pioneers. The progress of society has depended, so to say, upon those who did not hesitate to break the existing laws, whether religious, social or political. Only so could a higher law be evolved. Generally these law-breakers have been good, peaceful and patriotic citizens, as were Socrates, Jesus and Gandhi and a host of others known and unknown to history. They all broke the law to fulfil the law.

In our recent struggle to evolve a more just social order, we had to break many social and religious laws and conventions, having reference to unapproachability, caste, inter-dining, foreign travel etc. For all these violations the pioneer had to suffer social obloquy and ostracism. These are more stringent punishments than jail-going. They often involve the members of the family of the offending individual. All our modern religious, social and political reformers, such as Syed Dayanand, Keshab Chandra Sen, Gandhi, and all the other leaders and followers in the national struggle were law-breakers of one sort or the other. They all had to suffer, and some of them paid for their disobedience with their lives. Even scientific innovators have had to bear the cross for the advancement of knowledge. Those who have through the ages broken old conventions, whether in literature or art, had also to pay their price. In fact without disobedience to existing laws and conventions there can be no advance in any sphere of life. Yet all this is not criminal but *civil* disobedience. It is not anti-social, but rather it helps to organise society on firmer foundations and higher levels.

In what I have written I have made three points clear: (1) the law of the conscience is supreme, (2) civil disobedience can be offered, whatever the nature of the State, whether autocratic or democratic, and (3) civil disobedience is constitutional action and through apparently violating the law is really the fulfilment of the law.

I have discussed in this limited space only those aspects of civil disobedience. I have not discussed whether a particular movement of civil disobedience in the present is justified or not and whether it adheres to the conditions laid down by Gandhi—namely, adherence to truth and non-violence, readiness to bear the consequences willingly, humble submission to the law, etc. I have also not discussed whether in India today there is the necessary atmosphere for launching a movement of civil disobedience in any particular area against specific or general grievance. Whatever the atmosphere and the circumstances, individuals cannot escape the obligation of bearing witness to the truth that is in them and suffering the consequences.

Nuclear Explosions and World Peace

HORACE ALEXANDER

The present age is faced with a dilemma in the world of power politics which it may fairly be claimed is new : either the great nations of the world must heartily agree to renounce the use of the newest type of weapon, or the world will speedily be brought to an end. Hitherto, however drunk with power some world conqueror might become, he could only scourge half a continent at the most ; and normally, after the armies had passed, the peasants who remained alive would soon begin to rebuild their huts, replough their fields, and rebuild the foundations of civilized life. Indeed, as Gandhi long ago pointed out, if the history of man had really consisted, as the history books too often suggest, of the deeds of emperors and war lords only, mankind would long ago have perished. Happily, the truth has always been that the vast majority of human beings have lived peaceably with their neighbours, and have gone on quietly producing food and other necessities for life with little regard to the misdeeds of their rulers.

Today this is no longer the situation. Unless the rulers of the world learn to restrain their use of power, unless the poison of power can somehow be eradicated from the texture of the great Nation-State of our time, mankind is almost certainly doomed to perish, and to destroy this beautiful earth, with its inhabitants, trees and flowers, animals, birds and fishes, and all.

The philosopher, duly attracted to modern astronomical knowledge, may say : What does it matter, from the angle of eternity, whether life on one tiny satellite of one little star disappears into oblivion ? Will there not still be millions of stars and planets left ? But such an attitude will

hardly appeal to the ordinary man. This earth, and this earth alone, is the home of the human species as we know him. Apparently millions of years have been spent in bringing the earth to its present state of development. The cultural achievements of man even in the past few centuries of that vast story are such that every decent-minded human being must wish to pass them on, enriched if possible, to unborn generations for centuries to come. Perhaps the most horrible blasphemy of all is to suggest that perhaps it is now 'God's will' that the world should come to an end. Whatever else may be said about human folly, let not man accuse God of making him a fool. In the whole discussion, perhaps it is better to leave theology out.

Of course this does not mean that the issue facing the human race can be decided without some ultimate sense of values. Indeed, is it just here that we are in the greatest difficulty. Gandhi's life-task consisted in the effort to apply the moral law to politics. He refused to believe in the ordinary laws of political expediency. In particular, it was his conviction that the national State should rely no longer on military force for its defence, but that it should have the courage to disarm, even if necessary in the face of threats of armed aggression from its neighbours. But at the same time he was a realist. He knew that in fact neither the people of India nor the people of any other modern State had today the immense moral courage to follow this bold line. The vast majority of thinking officers of every State believe that it is a vital necessity to keep up armed forces adequate for 'defence'. And as it is futile to rely on armament that is out of date, this today comes very near to saying: 'We (Indians, Pakistanis, French, Germans, Japanese, whom you will) must have the latest nuclear bombs at our disposal; otherwise, the "enemy" will suddenly overwhelm us'. So we are back at our dilemma. Either we all agree to renounce these weapons, or we all go on making them, till someone starts the shooting, and the world ends in a mass of darkness.

Is there any way out? It must be confessed that the outlook is extremely gloomy. Deep mutual distrust still separates the nations of the world. The Americans do not believe that the Russians can ever be trusted to keep their promises, nor the Russians the Americans. The same, I think, is generally true as between Indians and Pakistanis; perhaps as between French and Germans, and so on. So what hope is there?

Some of our statesmen assure us that the chief hope comes from fear. All the statesmen today know that once the nuclear explosions

begin, rain is almost inevitable for every country, including even the one that begins the bombing. Therefore, no statesman really wants war. This is perhaps an advance from only twenty-five years ago when Hitler, for example, almost certainly wanted to wage a war of revenge, and would have felt himself cheated if he had got what he wanted without war. Of course, he calculated that he was bound to win. He was wrong, but only just wrong.

Today, it would be rather than ever for a powerful statesman to assume that his country would win. So, up to a point, fear is doubtless a deterrent on reckless policies. But as I write, the great powers still seem to be following their policies of 'Brinkmanship', that is, of pressing their opponent as hard as possible, under threat of letting loose the bombers if he does not give way, so that one wonders how long human endurance, on the part of innumerable young armies poised for instant action, to say nothing of their exhausted chiefs, endlessly negotiating for ends that are for ever as far away as the carrot suspended in front of the donkey's nose, can continue. Within another few years, surely there will be a catastrophe unless this unbearable tension is somehow relaxed. But how?

Philip Noel-Baker, in his remarkable book *The Arms Race*, has demonstrated that the powers have, within recent years, come near to a general agreement on disarmament, in spite of all the technical details. The failure has been due, not to technical difficulties, but to political considerations. His conclusion is that if, in every land, hundreds of dedicated men and women will devote themselves to the task of pressing for an agreed disarmament, the Governments will be obliged to make the agreements that have been so near and yet so far. At least, one may urge that citizens of the world who care for world peace should try to instruct themselves on what has happened, and continue to press their Governments to show greater courage.

Another type of action that is at least getting some attention from press and public is typified by the so-called Aldermaston marches in England. Those who take part in these marches are all dedicated to the conviction that it would be right for Britain to renounce the nuclear bombings absolutely, and to stop the manufacture of bombs without waiting for any international agreement, and to face the possible consequences, however disastrous from the point of view of national survival, without fear. This is, in fact, an appeal to the very opposite of fear, an appeal to what Gandhi called the *matchless power of truth*.

I have not been able to participate in these marches, but those who have done so, including some middle-aged men and women who are not, I am sure, carried away by easy heady enthusiasm, have found them profoundly stimulating and hopeful; and the response of the public has been more and more positive. It may well be that less than one per cent of the population of England is directly affected by such action. But the *spiritual forces of mankind have little relation to numbers or democratic majorities*. If a mighty force is being engendered, it will begin to influence the whole national mind, spreading hope and confidence and courage in the place of apathy, indifference, fear and despair.

I do not expect that these actions of a small minority, however dedicated, will suddenly lead the British Government to announce its determination to stop all nuclear preparations. Its effect is likely to be much less spectacular; but perhaps, in the end, even more profound.

So long as it is tacitly assumed on every side that the only things that finally count in human affairs, even in world politics, are military and economic might, there is little hope for mankind. Gandhi believed, and tried to demonstrate in his whole life, that *the power of the human spirit is mightier than the power of any bomb*. The right use of both reason and conviction can turn the world from hatred to a new era of fruitful cooperation. If we have faith that in the hearts of all peoples everywhere, whether they are Russians or Chinese or Poles or Americans, whether they are statesmen or financiers or ordinary men and women, there is an essential element of goodness, which can be released if they see that their neighbours have faith in them, then there is still hope that mankind can find the way to paths of peace and goodwill.

A Study of the Meanings of Non-violence

GENE SHARP

'Non-violence', 'non-violent resistance', 'resistance' and 'pacifism' are words now frequently found in such newspapers as the *Manchester Guardian*, *The Times*, and the *New York Times*.

The Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama, conduct a year-long non-violent bus boycott. Danilo Doko is jailed for leading hungry students in a non-violent demonstration. Jehovah's Witnesses continue to gain adherents to their creed, which includes refusal of military duty. The word "pacifism" appears frequently in news reports from Germany.

The crew of the ketch *Golden Rule* go to prison for attempting to stop U.S. nuclear tests by sailing into the Pacific 'proving grounds'. The Welsh Nationalists use non-violent resistance in addition to educational and electoral methods in their struggle for Welsh self-government. Young Frenchmen begin their fifth year in prison as war resisters.

London newspapers headline the arrest of 45 opponents of nuclear weapons for civil disobedience in non-violently "breaching" a rocket base site in an effort to halt construction. In India, Vachha Bhabe celebrates

* The first version of this article was a chapter of the writer's M.A. thesis in sociology, *Non-violence: A Sociological Study* (New York University, 1945). A slightly paraphrased revision appeared in *Studies* (Hyderabad, December 1946, under the title 'A Typology of Non-violence'). A pamphlet reprint of this, under the title *The Meaning of Non-violence*, was issued in 1947 by Hermann Spohnbeck, London. The writer then made several major changes and additions, included documentation and completely re-wrote the paper. This revision was published in the *American Journal of Civilizer Studies*, March 1948, under the title 'The Meanings of Non-violence: A Typology'. The present version is a further revision containing some new documentation, a more extensive introduction, and comments and descriptions illustrating the respective types of non-violence within the text itself.

buses land by 'tooting with love'. A Mennonite father refuses to send his children to an Otaw school because he believes they will be taught war-like and un-Godly ideas. Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall lectures to top British naval, army and air-force officers on 'The Alternative to the Nuclear Deterrent: Non-violent Resistance'. Women of Budapest stop Russian tanks by lying down in front of them.

Prime Minister Den Blumny, as a religious pacifist, helps resettle World War II refugees still without homes. South African 'Black Sash' women keep silent vigils to defend the Constitution. Hundreds in Britain march four days in rain, snow and sun to the Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Research Establishment in protest against nuclear weapons. The All-African Peoples' Conference in Accra pledges support for non-violent resistance, including civil disobedience, movements for the liberation of Africa.

Although almost everyone says the world must end war forever or be destroyed, the ideas and ideals of 'non-violence'¹ and methods of non-violent social action are still espoused by only minorities. But they have now risen to sufficient prominence that they must be reckoned with in world thinking and events. Gandhi is in large degree responsible for this. The impact of 'non-violence', however, is now felt in many parts of the world and arises from diverse sources. This increased awareness of 'non-violence' has come despite (or because of) the fact that many of the ideas, ideals and methods of 'non-violence' run counter to established orthodoxies and socially approved behaviour. They also stand in contrast to modern developments of violence: totalitarianism and nuclear weapons.

Despite this growing awareness of 'non-violence' there is widespread confusion about just what 'non-violence' is. All the above examples and many more have been labelled with the terms 'non-violence' and 'pacifism'. This lack of clarity has had its effect on the groups promoting non-violent approaches, on criticisms by their opponents, and on the thinking of still others. The usual degree of misunderstanding which may result from a varied and imprecise use of terms becomes plain confusion when the phenomena concerned are relatively little known. When these phenomena include unorthodox ideas, beliefs and methods of resistance—each of which may be associated with strong emotions among both proponents and opponents—the confusion may become chaos.

1. 'Non-violence' in this paper refers to the absence of physical violence against human beings. Fuller definitions are offered in subsequent sections.

At first glance, all that is 'not violence' may seem to be of a single kind. In a society where such systems of ideas, beliefs and behaviour are usually regarded as exotic, 'crack-pot', impractical, dangerous or simply strange, few people undertake a sufficiently serious examination of these phenomena to make them aware that quite different types of belief and behaviour are involved. 'Pacifism', 'passive resistance', 'non-violence' and the other terms are commonly used either as broad generalities (glittering, scathing or just vague) or with a wide variety of more specific meanings for the same word. A failure, however, to discern the very real differences among the various types of 'non-violence' and to exercise more care in the use of the terms may have a number of undesirable consequences. Two of these are that evaluation of the merits and demerits of these approaches will be seriously handicapped, and that research in this area will face unnecessary difficulties.

Persons rejecting violence on grounds of principle have rarely analysed the relation of their particular belief systems to others also rejecting violence. They have failed to do this largely because such analysis has seemed to them irrelevant: their duty was to follow the imperatives of their beliefs. However, some of them have recognized differences in motivation and behaviour among those rejecting violence.

For example, Guy F. Herikberger, a Mennonite, distinguishes between 'non-resistance' and 'modern pacifism'. Non-resistance, he says, describes the faith and life of those 'who cannot have any part in warfare because they believe the Bible forbids it, and who renounce all coercion, even non-violent coercion'. Pacifism, he says, is 'a term which covers many types of opposition to war'.¹

Some Western pacifists² have seen Gândhi's approach as sufficiently different from their own that they have felt it was not genuinely "pacifist". Reginald Reynolds writes: 'A reading of "official" [British] pacifist literature from, say, 1920 onwards would reveal some odd things which many pacifists would prefer to forget. People accepted as "leading pacifists" were, as late as 1930, writing obscure articles about Gândhi and defending British Rule in India. Such articles and letters could be found in *The Friend* (weekly unofficial paper of the Quakers), in *Reconciliation* (monthly organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation), and in *No More*

1 Herikberger, 'Biblical Non-resistance and Modern Pacifism', *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, July 1943, cited by Theodore Paulin, *Introduction to Non-violence* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Pacifist Research Bureau, 1944) p. 2.

2 'Pacifists' here refers to persons and groups refusing participation in war on ethical, moral or religious grounds.

War (the monthly organ of the [No More War] movement)].²

Western pacifists have sometimes distinguished between the 'religious' pacifists and the 'non-religious' pacifists who base their pacifism on 'humanitarian' or 'philosophical' considerations. This distinction has also been made by non-pacifists.³ Pacifists have also recognised differences among themselves in their response to military conscription. There have been: (a) the 'absolutists' who believe in total disobedience to such laws and refuse cooperation with the administrative agencies for military conscription even to obtain their personal exemption from military duty where the law allows for such exemption; (b) those who refuse entry into the armed forces (even as non-combatants) but are willing to co-operate with the conscription system to obtain their exemption from military duty and are willing to perform alternative civilian work where such alternative is allowed; and (c) those who refuse to bear arms but are willing to perform non-combatant (e.g. medical) duties within the armed forces.⁴

Although Gandhi never wrote systematic treatises on 'non-violence', he did distinguish between two or more types of 'non-violence'.⁵ After first calling his South African protest movements 'passive resistance', he discarded the term and adopted a new term, *satyagraha*.⁶ "When in a meeting of Europeans I found that the term "passive resistance" was too narrowly construed, that it was supposed to be a weapon of the weak, that it could be characterized by hatred, and that it could finally manifest itself as violence, I had to denier to all these statements and explain the real nature of the Indian movement. It was clear that a new word must be coined by the Indians to designate their struggle".⁷ Gandhi also seems to have assumed an implicit distinction between Western pacifism and *satyagraha*, although explicit statements to this effect are difficult to find. Bhagwan Kamlappa, in an introductory note to a small collection

2. Reynolds, "What Are Pacifists Doing?", *Peace News* (London), 30 July 1956.

3. For example, the U.S. conscription law provides for alternatives to military duty for those objecting to it because of religious belief and training, but denies such alternatives to objectors whose pacifism arises from a personal philosophy, humanitarianism, or social, economic or political views.

4. Military conscription laws throughout the world vary concerning provisions for objection. Many make no provisions for exemption from military duty or alternative civilian duty. Some include either or both provisions for objection establishing their sincerity. Still others provide either or both provisions only for certain objections, such as religious ones.

5. As will be indicated below, the term 'non-violence' is used in a much broader sense in this paper than it was by Gandhi.

6. *Satyagraha* will be defined below.

7. M. K. Gandhi, *The Story of My Experiments With Truth* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1955) p. 108.

of Gandhi's writings prepared for the World Peace Conference in India, December 1949–January 1950, writes: 'It is a far cry . . . from pacifism to Gandhi's idea of non-violence. While pacifism hopes to get rid of war chiefly by refusing to fight and by carrying on propaganda against war, Gandhi goes much deeper and sees that war cannot be avoided, so long as the seeds of it remain in man's breast and grow and develop in his social, political and economic life. Gandhi's cure is, therefore, very radical and far-reaching. It demands nothing less than rooting out violence from oneself and from one's environment.'¹⁰

The American sociologist Clarence Marsh Case in his study of such phenomena explicitly recognises differences between various types,¹¹ although he makes no attempt to develop a typology. He uses the terms 'non-violent resistance' and 'passive resistance' interchangeably.¹²

Political scientist Dr Milford Sibley has distinguished three types of 'non-violence': Hindu pacifism (*atyagraha*), Christian pacifism, and revolutionary secular pacifism.¹³ This classification, however, did not purport to encompass the field of 'non-violence' and was limited to those modern types of pacifism concerning political theory. Professor Leo Kuper of the Sociology Department of Natal University has distinguished between non-violent resistance movements acted at achieving their goals by means of embargoes and conversion of their opponents respectively;¹⁴ but, again, this does not purport to be a full typology.

Theodore Paulin¹⁵ comes close to developing a typology of 'non-violence', although this was not his main intention. Paulin structured his discussion on the basis of six types resulting from a continuum 'at one end of which we place violence coupled with hatred, and at the other, dependent only upon the application of positive love and goodwill. In the intermediate positions we might place (1) violence without hatred, (2) non-violence practised by necessity rather than because of principle, (3) non-violent coercion, (4) *atyagraha* and non-violent direct action, and (5) non-resistance'¹⁶. The non-violence extremity of his continuum.

10. Kumbhappa, 'Editor's Note' in Gandhi, *For Foreigners* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1948).

11. Case, *Non-violent Coercion: A Study in Methods of Social Pressure*, (New York, The Century Company, 1930) p. 207.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

13. Sibley, *The Political Theories of Modern Pacifism: An Analysis and Criticism* (Philadelphia, Pacifist Research Bureau, 1944).

14. See Kuper, *Passive Resistance in South Africa* (London, Jonathan Cape, 1936) pp. 73–74.

15. *Op. cit.*

16. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

'active goodwill and reconciliation', becomes the sixth type. Because Paulina's main objective in the booklet was to consider the application of 'non-violent means of achieving group purposes'¹⁷ his classification has suffered through lack of development and refinement. Some types of 'non-violence' have not been included,¹⁸ and some were classified incorrectly.¹⁹ Paulina has, however, made a genuine contribution towards developing a typology.

Generic Non-Violence

The whole genus of behaviour and belief characterized by an abstention from physical violence is hereafter described by the term 'generic non-violence'. This is the sense in which the term 'non-violence' has been hitherto used in this paper.²⁰ 'Generic non-violence' thus includes a wide variety of types of 'non-violence': all the examples briefly listed in the opening section of this paper and more. These vary widely on several points, such as whether 'non-violence' is viewed as intrinsically good or simply as an effective method of action, the degree of passivity and activity, the presence or absence of strategy, and whether the followers of the approach are 'other worldly' or 'this worldly'. These phenomena have in common only the abstention from physical violence, either generally or in meeting particular conflict situations, or both. Not included in this broad classification are: (1) hermits and (2) cases of cowardice (both involving a *de facto* withdrawal, though for different reasons, from aspects of life involving physical violence rather than the offering of a non-violent response in the situation); and (3) legislation, State decrees, etc., (backed by threat of physical violence, as imprisonment, execution, etc.).

Pacifism

The term 'pacifism' as here defined, includes the belief systems of those persons and groups who, as a minimum, refuse participation in all international or civil wars or violent revolutions and base this refusal on

17. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

18. For example, non-violent resistance with mixed motives of principle and expediency, and groups rejecting international wars but not necessarily personal violence.

19. For example, including William Lloyd Garrison's approach under 'unplanned and non-violent direct action'.

20. 'Generic non-violence' and 'non-violence' for the purposes of this typology have thus a much broader meaning than that given to 'non-violence' by Gandhi and certain other votaries of non-violence. Gandhi often referred to non-violence as being essentially the same as love. It was attitude, which involved non-injury in thought, word and deed to all living things. It rejected ill-will and hatred as well as physical violence. For clarity, the new term 'generic non-violence' will be used hereafter in this paper, now that the subject area has been introduced.

moral, ethical or religious principle. Such persons and groups are here called 'pacifists'. 'Pacifism' is thus a narrower term than 'generic non-violence', and is an intermediary classification including several of the types of generic non-violence described below. These are indicated below after the typology.

Non-Violent Resistance and Direct Action

'Non-violent resistance and direct action' is another intermediary classification, being both narrower than 'generic non-violence' and broader than the specific types. The methods of 'non-violent resistance and direct action' fall on a continuum between personal exemplary behaviour and verbal persuasion at one end and sabotage and physical violence at the other.

'Non-violent resistance and direct action' refers to those methods of resistance and direct action without physical violence in which the members of the non-violent group perform either (1) *acts of omission*—that is, they refuse to perform acts which they usually perform, and are expected by custom to perform, or are required by law or regulation to perform, or (2) *acts of commission*—that is, they insist on performing acts which they usually do not perform, are not expected by custom to perform, or are forbidden by law or regulation from performing, or (3) both.

Their methods are 'extra-constitutional'—that is, they do not rely upon established procedures of the State (whether parliamentary or non-parliamentary) for achieving their objective. Such acts may be directed towards a change in, or abolition of, existing attitudes, values, social patterns, customs or social structure, or a combination of these. Such change or abolition may take place whether these attitudes etc. are of the society as a whole or of only a section of it. Such acts may also be devoted, in defence of attitudes, values, social patterns, customs, or social structure, or a combination of these, against attempts of the opponents to alter or to abolish them, whether by the introduction of particular or general innovations or both.

In some cases of non-violent resistance and direct action the primary intent is to change attitudes and values as a preliminary to changing policies. In other cases, the primary intent is to change policies (or direct attempts to change policies) whether or not the opponents have first changed their attitudes and values. In other cases, the intent may be to change simultaneously attitudes and policies. Included in 'non-

violent resistance and direct action' are those cases where violence has been rejected because of (1) religious, ethical or moral reasons; (2) considerations of expediency; and (3) mixed motivations of various types. Where the behaviour of the non-violent group is primarily *resistance*, usually acts of omission, it can be described simply as 'non-violent resistance'. Where the behaviour of the non-violent group is primarily *intervention*, usually acts of commission, it can be described as 'non-violent direct action'.¹¹ The types of generic non-violence which are included in the category 'non-violent resistance and direct action'¹² are indicated below following the typology.

The Types of Generic Non-Violence

In developing this typology, the writer has sought to observe the 'natural' groupings or types as they seem to exist, rather than pre-selecting certain contents and then seeking to fit the phenomena into the pre-determined categories. After a classification of the types had been made, the writer sought to examine what were the intrinsic characteristics possessed by the respective types which distinguish them from the others. The criteria which emerged include such factors as whether the motivation for non-violence is expediency, principle, or mixed; whether the non-violent group's belief system is 'other worldly' or 'this worldly'; whether or not the non-violent group has a program of social change; what is the non-violent group's attitude towards the opponents; whether all or only some physical violence is rejected; whether the non-violent group is concerned with its own integrity; and others. Following the description of the types of generic non-violence, appears a chart listing the main criteria which emerged.

The nine types of generic non-violence described below are: non-resistance, active reconciliation, moral resistance, selective non-violence, passive resistance, peaceful resistance, non-violent direct action, un-

¹¹ 'Non-violent direct action' is discussed as a type of generic non-violence below in the typology.

¹² This classification is similar to Hilder's category, the 'generic strike': 'The [the generic strike] includes the labour strike, the social boycott, political non-cooperation, demonstrations against official acts, and other similar group conflicts. These various forms of non-participation, although differing in the occasions from which they arise and the ends which they seek, are essentially similar in their methods of concrete and collective control.' (C. T. Hilder, *The strike: A Study in Collective Action*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1914, p. 41.) 'Non-participation which is designed to interfere with official acts most frequently takes the form of a refusal to share in the prescribed institutional activities or to participate in political affairs. Occasionally it may involve a suspension of labour.' (Ibid., p. 124.)

grade, and non-violent revolution.^{23,24} These are listed roughly in the order of increasing activity.²⁵ There are no strict separations between some of these types, and particular cases may not seem to fit exactly into any one of them. This classification should be viewed simply as a tool to facilitate understanding and study of the phenomena, a tool which is neither perfect nor final, but may nevertheless be useful.

The examples cited and statements used as illustrations for the respective types have been chosen from those available to the writer on the basis of their adequacy as illustrations and because of the presence of reliable documentation. There is no pretence that the examples cited are geographically representative or exhaustive of the cases belonging to each type. Further research on each of these types could provide abundant additional examples and illustrative statements.

[*To be continued*]

23. There is no type labelled 'consciousness campaign' or 'war resistance', as such objection or resistance is a specific application of several of the types of generic non-violence included here.

24. In this review the writer has tried to offer terminology and definitions which, if adopted, might reduce future confusion in the literature. This has involved making adjustments in the existing terminology while seeking to use such terms as were harmonious with positive general usage. Hence, the broader, intermediary classes of 'passive' and 'non-violent resistance and direct action'. Hence, also, the use of the terms 'non-resistance', 'passive resistance', martyrdom and 'non-violent revolution' as ways having clear precedents, although the writer is aware the first two have also been widely used with varying consistencies. It has seemed necessary to coin new terms, such as 'generic non-violence', and 'selective non-violence' and to give more specific meanings to 'moral resistance' and 'political resistance'. The writer does not pretend this terminology is perfect, but in the absence of an alternative suggests an adoption. The final solution to the terminological problem may lie in creating entirely new terms, such as Gandhi did with *satyagraha*; the difficulties in gaining their general acceptance, however, might be greater than those of accepting the terms and definitions offered in this paper.

25. This order is necessarily somewhat arbitrary; the most active expression of one type may exceed in activity the most passive expression of the type(s) listed after it.

A Hymn From Tukaram

MAHADEV DESAI

Forbid it Lord that I should cast
My mental eye on thought of sin—
T'were better far my mind was blind.

Forbid it Lord I should dabble
My tongue with words of wicked worth—
T'were better far that I was mute.

Forbid it Lord that I should hear
Ill language used, grieve anyone—
T'were better far I had no ears.

Forbid it Lord that I should cast
An evil eye on sinner's dear—
Far better t'were that I was not.

Sick of these things am I, O Lord—
Your Takā—let me rest in Thee.

* Mahadev Desai passed away in 1917 at Godhok. In 1920 he fell seriously ill, almost blind, Yajurvedic Patraśāstra and many attended on him day and night for nearly a month. On Wednesday 11 February 1920, in the early hours of the morning, he was repeating a celebrated stanza of Tukārām—*Pāpān āśānt nāśā dīva dāh**, he felt the urge of reciting it into English verse. Two men so held the poet usually he scribbled these fourteen lines at 1 a.m. and handed them to me when I met him after our four o'clock prayer. It is never too late to share with the reader a thing which is twice sacred,—Kakā, Kāśikar.

Two Letters from Gandhi to Richard Gregg

Nanda Hill,
27 May 1927.

My dear Govind,

26425

The occasion for writing this letter is supplied by your capital letter of the seventeenth instant to Mahatmā, of which he has sent me a copy.

Your suggestions are all perfect, if the premises can be accepted by us. Probably Mahatmā has not even thought of what I am about to tell you ; though I shouldn't be surprised if he has also thought of the same thing, for I think that he has estimated the ingratitude of the spinning movement. What I want to state is this. the movement is bound to fail if we expect to succeed by adopting the same methods, or very nearly the same methods with necessary adaptations, as the adversary, if such a term can be properly used under a plan of life which admits of no enemies. In my opinion, we have to devise other ways of making the movement a living and universal force, at least so far as India is concerned. The adversary believes in the latent appliances and therefore is bound to adopt the methods of those who are adepts in using those appliances ; but in the spinning movement, modern appliances are largely discarded and the few that are retained are used in a different way. Typewriters, shorthand assistants and the like are taken in our movement as a temporary measure. Immediately one goes to the villages, these become a hindrance rather than a help. If the movement has to depend upon first class stenography it will fail before long. For

it cannot make any headway under these conditions beyond the cities. It cannot spread even if it has to depend upon the English language for its spread. And so you find that at the *Adress*, in the Association office and even here we are managing with most indifferent stenography. Even if we advertised, we shall probably not get the best stenographer, because he will know that there is room only for half a dozen stenographers in the movement, and then we shall have to pay not 100 or 125 [rupees], which is the most I think that is being paid, but we should have to pay anything between 300 and 400 [rupees] for getting the assistance such as you have in mind. I should quite agree with you if you argue that even that salary would be an economy even if only one man has to be obtained. Experience, however, shows that it is not possible to retain the services of such a man unless you are prepared to allow him to become the master and to dictate his own terms in every respect. Thus it would be useless to have an able stenographer who has no faith in the movement, who would disdain to wear *kāḍī* and who would require polished furniture before he will settle down to work. The spinning movement, so far as I can see, will never afford the high wages that are demanded by good men in such a line of business. Do you know that in *kāḍī* service if we offer high wages even to one man there is immediately and naturally a ferment throughout the rank and file and they would all begin to compare their low wages to the high wage given even to one single man. The proper working of the spinning movement is still being evolved. It is in a state of flux, and it will be some time before it can be said to be stabilised. It is a movement which has to grow from within. It is a movement which requires a fair measure of continuous sacrifice from those who have become accustomed to easy life. The class of men and women required for the movement have got to be trained and brought up. They cannot therefore be had by advertising. The reason why we have not got efficient stenography is because no endeavour has been made to train stenographers. It is quite possible, for instance, to make of Chhaganji, Mahadev, Krishnadevi, Pykaji and many others whom I can name first-class stenographers. But it was considered not worth while doing so. It would have been like throwing away a rupee for a pie, and so we are managing with fourth-rate stenographers hoping that if they assimilate the spirit of the movement they will distinguish themselves in the work they have undertaken by coming up to the highest level. I have entered into this elaborate argument—very badly expressed, because it is for the first time that I am reducing to writing the thought about the movement—because I am anxious that you who are saturated with the spirit of the spinning movement should understand all that is at the back of my mind and then give me the benefit of your criticism. If I have not

expressed myself clearly, as I am afraid I have not, do not please hesitate to ask me for further explanation, and by an interchange of a few letters, probably I shall be able to express myself more clearly than I have done. But, of course, apart from what I have said above, there is much to be said for your view.

Young Jinks and Mayhew are not all I want them to be. There are reasons for it, into which however I need not enter just now. Some are avoidable and some are unavoidable. I hope to be able to cope with those that are avoidable.

I got the book on vitamins. I read it through as soon as I got it. It is a good book. But it failed to convince me. The subject of vitamins has still, so far as I can see, to be investigated. The author's statement does not appear to me to be the final word. The ruling out of all the nuts and the pulses in preference to meat-foods goes against the grain and is contrary to all I have read in the vegetarian literature. If what the authors have said be the final word about them, it is a severe blow to vegetarians. But the authors could not possibly have sufficient data about the effect of nuts and pulses to enable them to come to a just decision. Accurate observation about the efficacy or the inefficacy of vegetable protein foods can only be made on an extensive scale in India, where alone one meets thousands of born vegetarians. Their diet and their habits have to be scientifically observed and analysed before safe deductions can be drawn; and then, too, there are so many disturbing factors. Climate, harmful customs and such like have to be taken into account before using the values of foods taken by them. I am therefore taking all the statements in that book with a great deal of caution. The late A.F. Hills was President of the Vegetarian Society in London. He was a good man. I do not know the extent of his scientific knowledge. But he indulged in bold speculations about diet. He carried on a series of experiments himself. He wrote a number of articles on what he called "vital food". He divided foods into three or four divisions: one for those whose occupation was predominantly body-labour, another for those whose occupation was predominantly intellectual; a third for those whose occupation was predominantly spiritual; and the fourth for those who were not in a healthy condition. His reasoning used to appeal to me in those days. I do not know whether it would now if I read all his writings afresh. I followed also keenly the controversy going on in the medical profession in those days about food values, and I know that one army of doctors defended white bread for all they were worth, and another army suggested that white bread was the staff of death and that brown bread alone was the staff

of life. There was even a Bread Reform League with Miss Yates as its energetic secretary. I used to come in close contact with the lady. But I learnt even then that either side was fanatical, either produced statistics and analyses of various types of bread. No one had sufficient data for its absolute conclusions. For they could not get a large number of men who would for the sake of their observations undertake to live purely on brown bread and water or white bread and water. I remember one example that was given by a doctor. I think it was Dr. Almon. He said he put one of his dogs upon white bread for one month and it died, and another upon brown bread for one month and it lived. The irresistible inference was that white bread was the stuff of death and brown bread was the stuff of life. He did not state whether both the dogs were kept under restraint the whole of the time, nor did he state whether both the dogs started with the same stomach. Let me confess that in those days, that is nearly forty years ago, I sided with Dr. Almon and I swallowed his testimony about the dogs and used to eat nothing but brown bread, and in the brown bread variety also largely Almon's brown bread, because the worthy Doctor took care to emphasize the necessity of taking Almon's brown bread, for that alone contained the whole wheat-meal ground to the necessary fineness. He was a good man. I read all his writings. Even in 1914, I consulted him when I was suffering from pleurisy and when I constantly refused to take even milk. Probably the worthy Doctor is still alive. All the same, I came to distrust, as experience ripened, most of the arguments of the type I have mentioned. The upshot of all this is to tell you that I have not made many changes in my food beyond what I reported to you. I still take unboiled milk. I dilute it with water. The milk that comes fresh from the goats is poured over boiling water: that gives the necessary warmth to the milk and addition of water makes it lighter. I am taking yet a little bread or a little *bhakur* made of home-ground wheat, and I am taking one green vegetable. The authors of the book say that addition of soda destroys the vitamins in the vegetables. But without soda, the vegetables refuse to be soft. I have therefore decided to add soda to the vegetables. It is difficult to digest it unless it is thoroughly cooked. Uncooked green cabbage, my system rejects. You will have observed that all the four vitamins are to be found in milk. They are to be found also in the fruits I am taking and therefore I do not lose much by adding soda at the time of cooking cabbage or Indian marrow. There is no difficulty about the cooking of spinach without soda and so whenever I get spinach, soda is not added. There is no occasion for worry about my health, for I seem to be getting better, though slowly. No food will give me personal satisfaction unless I can revert to fruits and nuts. But it seems to me that I shall

have to close this earthly life without getting that personal satisfaction.

With love,

Yours sincerely,
Bhū.

Forgive this very long letter. I did not know it was going to be so long.

Nandī Hill,
29 May 1927.

My dear Govind,

ms. B.1.2.2

I have your very important letter. It crossed mine. I cannot appropriate the credit you give me for gentle criticism of your handwriting. What I wanted to say was that, although I liked handwritten letters, there was no occasion for you to revert to writing your letters for my sake and that you should continue typewriting as you believe in it, and as I know it does result in economy of time; nor do I consider your handwriting to be bad. It might be clearer. But fortunately for my friends, I have my own writing as the criterion, and that being so, I know very few whose writing is worse than mine; and yet, because of my dislike of typewriters, if I could possibly write with my own hand, I would prefer an illegible hand in preference to having my letters typed or typing them myself. The reason underlying is this. If I have any concern for my friends, I should endeavour to write a better and more legible hand. The typewriter is a cover for indifference and laziness. Moreover, I believe in the dictum that handwriting reveals the writer. Typewriting certainly results in economy of time. But, whilst I admit that time is money, I do not admit that money is everything, and therefore I am conscious of innumerable occasions when economy of time would be misplaced. And the ironies that the typewriter is making have all but destroyed the magnificent art of calligraphy. I wonder if you have seen old hand-written manuscripts when people used to pour forth their very soul into their work. But I must not stray away from the subject on which I want to write.

Your suggestion about selecting a few untouchable boys and making them ideal farmers does great credit to your heart. But it betrays your ignorance of the situation. Even if half-a-dozen untouchables could be trained as you suggest, that will in no way bring us

nearer the solution of the problem of 'untouchability'. The (on this matter) petrified Hindu mind will immediately say: We shall touch every 'untouchable' who has qualified himself as these six men have. You perhaps know that there have been many parish saints, but their sanctity has not saved this suppressed class. The orthodox mind again argues: the parish saint becomes so because of his past *karma* and he naturally commands our respect. When the others do likewise, they will also command the same respect. It is this immoral deduction from the theory of *karma* which has got to be combated at every step, and the Hindu mind has got to be educated by fierce penance to understand that the theory of *karma* is not intended to kill all reform and all effort, but that it is intended for mankind to work off all evil *karma*, and he who does not do so is not entitled to belong to the human species. The Hindu mind has therefore to be educated to regard untrammelledly as equals the lowest, the fallen and the downtrodden and to give them a helping hand to us to make them level with the rest. And why, apart from the question of 'untouchability', should not the most promising from the 'touchables' be sent out to become accomplished farmers and try the experiment suggested by you? Surely you do not wish to imply that the 'touchables' in their grade will not care to learn farming with a view to utilizing human excreta as manure. If that is your argument, it would be wrong to expect 'untouchables' to handle work which others would consider as degrading. As you know, at the *Adram* we have 'untouchable' boys. We do not even ask them to do the menial work. The initiative is taken by the so-called high-caste men, for on such points the so-called 'untouchables' would be very touchy. I am having that experience everywhere. Underlying your suggestion, therefore, is the question not of 'untouchability' but of improved farming methods along simple lines.¹ But I have not handled this question energetically, simply because I believe in the doctrine of one thing at a time. There is much scattered work here, so much business, so much

1. Mr. Ghose's suggestion, which he made in the course of a letter, is somewhat as follows: "The special feature of the farm would be its use of night-soil as fertilizer, burying it as is done at the Satchghatwara, or treating it as do the farmers of China and Japan. The whole body of sweepers in the entire area from which the collection would be made would need to be carefully organized and gradually trained into the best ways of handling the stuff."

"In a very short time such a farm would become wonderfully productive in such crops, such as fodder, fruit or various kinds of vegetables, all of which could be sold in the same locality, thus avoiding transportation charges in the marketing and yielding a fair profit for the further development of the whole sweepers community of the city or district. Such use of the night-soil would be an enormous saving of very valuable material which is now not only almost entirely wasted, I believe, but is a source of much disease and consequent economic loss to the entire community, through the breeding of flies and the carrying of all sorts of germs and filth."

blind sensation, so little concentration, that it is necessary to hammer away at one very simple but fairly universal thing, and if that succeeds, the rest can follow. Agriculture is such a thing, but it can only be improved when it receives state assistance. In an ill-governed country, I think, with Theorem, that the artisan who rents the evil government must renounce property. And without assurance of settled ownership, it is impossible to do much in the way of agriculture. I do not want to elaborate this. I have said sufficient to enable you to fill in the rest. Whilst your suggestion does not seem to me to be feasible so far as the 'untouchables' are concerned, and difficult of accomplishment even as a general scheme, the extract sent by you is valuable, and I propose, as soon as I find space, to reproduce it in *Young India*² so that those who are at all inclined in the direction might take the matter up.

I did not get the larger volume about vitamins. What I got was *Food and Health*. But that book also gives enough information about vitamins. Dr Kellogg's writings I know, I have read his book, and if it has not been lost as many of my books have been, it must be in the *Ahimsa* library. However, you seem to know him personally, and I shall look forward to what he has to say. Have you put the whole case before him and asked whether he can suggest an effective vegetarian substitute for milk in the case of patients ?

With love to you all,

Yours sincerely,
Bāpū.

R. R. Crogg Esq.,
Kotgarh,
Simla Hills.

2. Reproduced in the issue of 9 June 1927, under the title 'What We are Lacking' in an introductory paragraph Gandhi wrote: 'The readers of *Young India* are familiar with Mr. Crogg's name. He is studying as a very concrete manner and with a genuine warmth of a patriotic son of the soil the many questions affecting his land. His theories and experiments in hand-spinning continue unabated. He is experimenting in the education of the children of backward classes. He is interested in the welfare of these classes. And in that connection, he is studying the question of agriculture. Having watched the economic and highly hygienic disposal of nitrogen in the Satyagraharam, Shikharpur, he is now studying that question in a methodical manner.'

Gandhi and the Praja Socialist Party

ROHIT DAVE

The Praja Socialist Party has been formed by the coming together of three ideological trends ; one represented by the old Socialist Party, the other by the Kishin Mardar Praja Party and the third by the Forward Bloc. This confluence of ideological trends is the result of a slow meeting of politics and ideas in each one of these three groups resulting in the intermingling of the streams into a homogeneous whole. The principles underlying the Gaya theme of the PSP represent the synthesis so evolved and point to a still further integration of Gandhian thought and socialist ideology. The study of the impact of Gandhian philosophy on the Praja Socialist Party is thus in essence the study of the maturing of socialist and Gandhian streams of thought under the stress of the concrete situations which both faced in their efforts to achieve a goal which was equally cherished.

The commonality of values is the real cementing force between the two trends of thought. Both Gandhism (if the Gandhian values, principles and means can be so described for the sake of brevity) and socialism stood for the freedom of the individual and of the nation from dominance ; both looked upon mass action as the only means of achieving the freedom of India from foreign domination, and both believed that freedom should ultimately result in the uplift of the down-trodden. A further cementing bond from the beginning was the acceptance of Congress discipline in the struggle for freedom, which in effect meant the leadership of Gandhi. Whatever the ideological pre-occupations of the Congress Socialist Party during its formative period, at no time did it keep itself aloof from the satyagraha campaigns of the Congress or the plea that non-violence was insisted upon by Gandhi.

from those who participated in the campaign. It is out of these common efforts and experiences that ultimately a common outlook emerged.

The Congress Socialist Party started as a Marxist-Leninist Party. The astrophilists who were interned in the Nink jail were perturbed at the weakening of the movement of mass defiance outside and were dismayed to find that organised workers and landless labourers were not participating in the movement to the extent they expected them to do. There began then a painstaking search for this crucial weakness in the struggle for freedom and under the influence of the teachings of Marx and Lenin they came to the conclusion that the ideological leadership of Ghandhi was responsible for it. Accordingly, when they came out of jail they decided to supply a correct ideological base to the freedom movement and evolved a thesis for the purpose. All the Congress members who subscribed to this thesis were invited to form a party within the Congress—a party of Congress Socialists.

This origin of the Congress Socialist Party—the oldest constituent party of the PSP—needs to be stressed because it points to the conditions necessary for the commingling of Gandhian and socialist ideologies. The Congress Socialists were ultimately converted to some of the basic tenets of the Gandhian philosophy because they had conceived of Marxism-Leninism as a weapon of freedom for men and nations, which they accepted as the highest goal of human existence. And perhaps it may not be very presumptuous to submit that the Gandhians were drawn towards socialist values and socialist objectives, without subscribing to socialist theories, because they saw that the teachings of Marx and Lenin were capable of creating some of the finest soldiers in the struggle for freedom, yielding to none in their capacity to sacrifice for the liberation of their motherland.

The Congress Socialist Party thus started as the Marxist-Leninist Party and accepted the main tenets of that school. Many of these principles remained right up to the Policy Statement of the (old) Socialist Party adopted by the General Council of the Party in August 1947 at Nâgpur. In that Policy Statement it was asserted that democratic means could be 'used for the capture of State power only where full political democracy is functioning and the working class, the peasantry and the lower middle class have reached a high level of maturity and have created a powerful political party'. The Statement goes on to say 'Where these conditions do not exist, democratic methods must be ineffective and inadequate and sometimes dangerous.'

By implication, therefore, insurrectionary overthrow of the State in existence was to be preferred except under the conditions listed above. At the same time it was conceded that the Constituent Assembly was making efforts to create a democratic State. Insurrectionary means were, therefore, to be adopted only if the effort failed and if 'democracy be limited or perverted by theocratic concepts or by feudal and vested interests'.

But this position was soon modified by the General Council of the Party at Bangalore in October 1949 when a revised thesis was adopted. In this revised Policy Statement the essence of the socialist methodology was seen in the technique of mass awakening and mobilisation: insurrectionary means were distinguished from terrorist action, *persecution* or conspiratorial violence. Instead of laying down strict conditions for the use of democratic means, now the conditions for resorting to insurrectionary means were rigorously prescribed. 'Insurrectionary means become inevitable', says the new Policy Statement, 'when a small class of privileged and vested interests rule by force over the entire people who cannot be rid of the rulers except through a violent overthrow'. It was further pointed out that by the time the new thesis would be adopted the framework of Indian democracy would be very near completion. The Policy Statement then comes to this conclusion: 'Taking into account the entire situation in the country and the future possibilities, democratic means appear to be the only correct means to follow, the only means that can be effective'.

Explaining this change of emphasis, Sri Jagaprakash Nirayan who was the General Secretary of the Party at that time admitted that the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi were responsible for this new outlook as much as the changed conditions due to the achievements of independence and the framing of the Constitution by the Constituent Assembly. Speaking just after the adoption of the revised Statement of Policy, he said at Madras that Gandhi was the one tremendous fountain in India from which socialism derived and would continue to derive inspiration. 'If Marx were to be alive today', he said, 'I am sure that he would certainly not have withdrawn himself into a shell and closed his eyes to Gandhi's precepts and practices'.

The influence of Gandhian thought on the revised version of the Policy Statement is not to be seen only in the emphasis on democratic methods as opposed to those of insurrection. There is also a better apprehension of the content of the democratic method in the revised version. It is pointed out in the Statement that democratic means

should not be confused with more constitutional or parliamentary means. 'Though the first include the second, they are far wider in scope. Civil resistance, *satyagraha*, strikes (in certain circumstances) are not constitutional means. Yet they are democratic means.' Here again the influence of Gandhi was expressly acknowledged by Śrī Jayaprakash Narayan. He said: 'Mahatma Gandhi was a great social force. . . . He gave us a weapon—the weapon of *satyagraha*—which has been effectively used by thousands of our countrymen in Punjab, Champaran, Mahadiksha, Tinnevely and other places. Gandhi is the one tremendous fountain in India from which socialism will continue to derive inspiration.'

The same pervasive influence of Gandhian thinking is also seen in the assertion in the revised Policy Statement that the Socialist Government by itself cannot build socialism. 'The Socialist Government alone cannot build up socialism, but the people as a whole, working through their trade unions, peasant peñcherys, cooperatives, youth, cultural and other popular organisations must do it.'

Till 1947 the emphasis was on class organisations, development of class consciousness and preparing for the class struggle. The primary task of the Socialist movement was defined as 'the creation of class organisations of the toiling people and the development of their class consciousness and of their struggle for freedom from want and exploitation and social injustice'. This passage was retained in the 1949 version but a new paragraph on constructive activities was added. The opening lines of this paragraph read as follows: 'In a democratic climate and working with democratic means, the struggle of the exploited classes and their efforts to emancipate and equip themselves for the task of governance and management of society assume other forms than merely class organisations.'

Thus, in its assessment of the potency of democratic means and the deepening of its meaning, in its insistence on the resort to these means as far as possible and on creating the necessary organisational set-up to make these means effective, Socialist thinking was drawing nearer to the teachings of Gandhi, assimilating his teachings and candidly acknowledging them as the source of inspiration to rethink some of the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism and to give them a new orientation and content.

While on this point it is also worth mentioning that the deep ethical appeal of the Gandhian teachings was also being imbibed by the leaders of the Socialist Party. Gandhi always insisted that we are

the architects of our destiny, that we are the active agents equipped with tremendous moral force to end social injustice and to usher in a more acceptable social order. If we fail to do so the blame lies at least as much on us as on the circumstances outside our control. This point was emphasised in the following passage in the revised Policy Statement. 'Further enlargement of the democracy is dependent largely on the growth of the Socialist movement itself. The stronger this movement grows the fuller shall be our democracy. On the other hand, the more responsible does left-wing inflexibility become the greater the danger of fascism and reaction. The Socialist Party is thus no mere tool in the hands of circumstances. Rather the Party is itself a considerable factor in the shaping of circumstances.' The acceptance of the responsibility for one's own destiny is perhaps one of the noblest lessons which Socialism accepted from Gandhism in 1949.

A similar development is noticeable in the theory of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' also. In the 1947 Policy Statement the role of the State as an instrument of social change is emphasised and it is postulated that if the new state 'is threatened and insecure, the counter-revolutionary elements in society would be suppressed by force. In other words a dictatorship of the proletariat would have to be established.' This theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat was sharply distinguished even then from the concept of constrained democracy. It was laid down that this dictatorship 'shall not be dictatorship of a single class, or worse, of a single party'. All the classes forming the proletariat, and all their parties, except those that believed in totalitarianism, would be allowed to function in complete freedom, it was promised. In the passage dealing with democratic socialism, it was further argued that according to Marxism there can be no socialism without democracy. 'Therefore in the socialist society of our conception', says the 1947 Policy Statement, 'the individual, that is the worker, is free and the State has no power to deprive him of his rights and privileges except through due process of law'. He was also assured freedom of association, speech and participation in the government of the country. The economic power in the democratic socialist society of the Socialist Party would be shared by the Government with the representatives of the proletariat. All this was meant to distinguish the socialist order from the one prevailing in the Soviet Union.

In the revised Policy Statement of 1949 the possibility of proletarian dictatorship and its detailed description were retained. But in his speech at Madras, to which reference has already been made, Sri. Jayaprakash admonished his fellow workers for not responding with

means known to the goal of democratic socialism, with the emphasis on democracy. He added: 'If we are not fighting merely for power or the "dictatorship of the proletariat" but for certain values, if we are fighting against exploitation, injustice and tyranny of every kind, Democratic Socialism alone can be our goal'. The words were still retained but they were undergoing a radical change in the minds of the leaders who were using them. And this change was acknowledged to be due to the great social force of Mahātmā Gandhi.

By 1950, thus, a clear shift towards Gandhian principles and values is visible in the policy of the old Socialist Party. The Marxist links were by no means snapped. The policy still rested on Marxist theories and was formulated in terms of Marxist concepts and even Marxist terminology. But hostility towards Gandhian principles and Gandhian means was distinctly weakening, and Gandhi's contribution to social philosophy and revolutionary techniques was realised. His search for truth, his passion for social change, his faith in the masses and mass action, his opposition to middle-class philistinism, were recognised and applauded. Gandhism was thus permeating every aspect of socialist philosophy and was reorienting it long before the Raja Socialist Party was formed. In fact the confluence of the three parties became possible because of the powerful impact of Gandhian thought on the minds of the Socialists who had fought the battle for independence under his leadership.

During the Fifties at least two significant steps have been taken by the Socialists in the direction of Gandhian principles. One of these is a clearer recognition of the importance of labour-intensive techniques for the under-developed economy of India with its vast unemployed population; and the other is an attempt to formulate a socialist conception of morality. An impassioned plea was made for a shift towards small-machine technology in the Statement of Policy issued in 1954. In the earlier policy documents it was emphasised that to make labour more productive and less toilsome it was necessary to make the greatest possible use of science and technology. Mahātmā Gandhi, on the other hand, insisted on labour-intensive techniques of production to give employment to the teeming millions of the nation. His opposition to machines as such had softened during the course of years and he had conceded the use of machines provided that the machines did not become the masters of men. But his advocacy of village and regional self-sufficiency and the ideal of the reduction of wants to the minimum did not give much scope for any large-scale introduction of machine technology into the country.

Socialist thought, while not agreeing with Gandhi on the minimum use of machines, had come to realise that no egalitarian social pattern was possible in India if a controlled machine economy was allowed full sway. At the same time it was opposed to extreme methods of production which did not allow sufficient leisure to workmen and farmers and demanded an undue expenditure of human energy for the production of goods. It therefore advocated a compromise in the form of small-unit technology. The 1954 Statement of Policy recognised the pressure of the teeming millions on the country's economy but asserted that decentralised technology alone could offer a proper solution to this problem. 'The only way to diversify the occupation', says the Statement, 'and to rationalise the existing ones is through the invention of a pervasive technology, which will be a small unit, will not require concentration and will go into the village and town.' The PSP has still to work out the details of the organisational set-up and integration of this sector with the economy as a whole.

The Policy Statement adopted at Gaya in 1955 added two important chapters: one on the 'Socialist Conception of Morality' and the other on 'Socialist Culture'. These chapters are based on concepts of morals and culture as developed in the Marxist literature. But the chapters go much beyond them and draw freely from the fountain of Gandhian teachings also. The need for establishing a social order free from exploitation, oppression and domination is stressed, but it is also conceded that 'there must be a simultaneous change in human activity and the social system to secure moral development'.

The pervasive influence of Gandhian thought on the policy and program of the Praja Socialist Party is thus quite manifest. This is not, however, to suggest that the PSP represents just another school of Gandhian philosophy. The thinking of the Praja Socialist Party is still based on some of the essential tenets of Karl Marx and its general outlook on and approach to social problems are significantly determined by his writings. But the PSP does not recognise Marxism as a set of rigid formulae which have to be mechanically applied to all situations. It believes that it is the very essence of Marxism that it should evolve and find new answers to new problems facing the socialist. The PSP considers that in the search for these new answers the Gandhian teachings are a very valuable guide. In its policies, therefore, attempts are made to synthesise the Marxist and the Gandhian teachings so as to emphasise equally the socialist and the humanist aspects of the human personality.

Henry S. L. Polak

HOMER A. JACK

In 1904 Mohandas Gandhi, then a successful lawyer in Johannesburg, was eating in a vegetarian restaurant. A young man dining at a near-by table sent Gandhi his card and expressed a desire to meet him. The thirty-five-year-old Gandhi invited this 21-year-old to come to his table, and he did so saying "I am sub-editor of *The Critic*. When I read your letter to the press about the plague, I felt a strong desire to see you. I am glad to have this opportunity." This young man was Henry S. L. Polak. In writing about this encounter in his autobiography, Gandhi added "Mr Polak's candour drew me to him. The same evening we got to know each other. We seemed to hold closely similar views on the essential things of life. He lived a simple life. He had a wonderful faculty of translating into practice anything that appealed to his intellect."

Some time later Polak went to the Johannesburg railway station to see Gandhi off on a journey to Natal and left for him to read during the journey John Ruskin's book, *Unto The Last*. Gandhi later wrote that the book was 'impossible to put aside, once I had begun it. . . . I determined to change my life in accordance with the ideals of the book.'

Gandhi and Polak became close friends and eventually co-workers in South Africa until Gandhi left that continent in 1914 never to return. Although for most of their lives thereafter Gandhi lived in India and Polak lived in England, their friendship was broken only by Gandhi's death in 1948. Polak died eleven years later, in February 1939. What follows is an account of the time I was privileged to meet Polak in England, in March 1937, almost two years before his death.

We had corresponded and he had invited me to meet him in London and spend the night with his wife and himself at their home in

the Channel town of Folkestone. I met Polak at the National Liberal Club, near Charing Cross Station, at mid-afternoon. He registered me as a guest and we went up the broad stairway to the smoking room for tea. On our way up he pointed out a retired editor of *The Times of India*. Polak half-apologized for being a member of the Liberal Club, saying that he was more Labour, but he had belonged here for a great number of years.

Over tea, Polak said that he first met Jawaharlal Nehru in 1909 when he was sent to India by Gandhi and there was introduced to the Nehrus—Motilal and Jawaharlal. He next ran into Jawaharlal Nehru in 1927 when the latter was in Folkestone, returning from his first visit to Russia. He said that he first met Rajendra Prasad during the indigo agitation. As for his first meeting with Gandhi, he retold the story. He went to South Africa with his uncle who was in the chemical business, but he preferred journalism and was employed by the *Transvaal Critic*. Later he became attached to Gandhi and studied law in his Johannesburg office.

Just before four o'clock we left the club to catch the train to Folkestone. Enroute Polak showed me a weekly published by the office of the Indian High Commissioner in London and he told me that he is on the board of directors of the Indian Students YMCA—although he is not a member of the Christian community. He was born into the Jewish faith, he reminded me, as we went through the outskirts of London, but he was quite active in Theosophist circles. We talked about Gandhi and India and Africa as London became Kent and as the green fields became Folkestone. (Polak was born in near-by Dover in 1882.) It was somewhat wet and foggy as we walked from the railroad station to his home at 49 Earles Street.

Miss Graham Polak, his wife, greeted us. She showed me to my room and by 6:30 we were having a vegetarian supper. Polak said he had been a vegetarian since 1904. Also at supper were Miss Polak's two sisters, one of whom was with the Polaks in South Africa. Miss was talkative and, with urging, recalled her days with Gandhi vividly. She reconstructed the scene of their marriage. She said that she was engaged to Polak in England, but Polak's father had discouraged the marriage since life in South Africa would be too strenuous for her. Polak himself was not too enthusiastic about marrying since he first wanted to accumulate funds for the marriage. So Gandhi it was who convinced Henry Polak. "When there is a heart union, as in your case, it is hardly right to postpone marriage merely for financial considerations. If poverty is

a bee, poor men can never marry.' Polak was convinced, but then asked Gandhi to write persuasive letters to the elder Polak and also to Millic. He wrote her that there would be a warm welcome in his home, where her fiancé was already a member of the family. She finally left for South Africa and in December 1903 arrived by train in Johannesburg, to be met at the station by Polak and Gandhi.

Recalling his early meeting with Gandhi, Polak said that he brought that famous book by Ruskin from London to Johannesburg and the actual volume is now in the Gandhi Museum in New Delhi. He recalled that he was walking with Gandhi, and had scarcely left his side when Gandhi was attacked by a Pathan and almost killed on the streets of Johannesburg. After Gandhi recovered somewhat in the house of the Dokan, he moved in with the Polaks. Henry Polak asserted that he knew them—in 1905—that Gandhi would not die a natural death!

After eating gooseberry pie and non-alcoholic cider, we had coffee in the sitting room. Polak diffidently showed me three illuminated memorials he had received from the Indian community in South Africa when he left in 1916. On leaving Africa in 1914, Gandhi asked Polak to take care of the Indian community there, but Polak told him that he could not accept that heavy responsibility. In 1916-17 Polak and his wife—and two sons—lived in India and with the aid of Gokhale he helped and the practice of Indians going to South Africa as indentured labourers. Returning to England, Polak pursued a combined career in journalism and law. He wrote for several newspapers in Malaya, India and Ceylon and his law firm (with his son as partner) represented Indian corporations in Privy Council cases. Business, however, fell off after Indian independence and they had to close their Indian office for lack of clients.

During our after-dinner conversation, Polak turned on the nine o'clock BBC news. There was a story that a plane carrying Nehru took fire, but nobody was hurt. After the news, Polak reconstructed for me those historic days when Gandhi devised satyagraha in South Africa. Polak was his lieutenant in the non-violent army, leading the march into the Transvaal when Gandhi was arrested. He was arrested himself and imprisoned with Gandhi. For a time Polak was acting editor of *Indian Opinion*, Gandhi later was to write about Millic Polak that she 'not only never came in her husband's way, but was a perfect helpmate to him during the struggle'.

Polak showed me his extensive library of Gandhiana. He said that

he might give it some day to the High Commissioner's office in London. He pointed to a whole shelf of books by and about that other early English friend of Gandhi and of Indian freedom, C.F. Andrews. He said he first met Andrews in South Africa in 1913 when the Anglican priest was sent there by Gokhale to help Gandhi and the Indian community.

As I went to bed early that evening, Polak seemed quite willing to continue to recall the past, but I was tired from the trans-Atlantic plane trip of the previous night. He did show me three figurines of Gandhi on his desk, one in marble, the others of glass. Also there was a sketch of Gandhi made in 1931.

In the morning, after breakfast, we took the train back to London. Polak told me that he saw Gandhi occasionally in 1913 during the Round Table Conference in London. He did not, however, see as much of him during that three-month period as he would have liked to do. He kept in contact with Gandhi's sons, having known Devadas as a boy and having taught him English. Polak told how in 1956, after the death of Gandhi, but before the death of Devadas, he was invited by the Government of India to go to India to help identify Gandhi's handwriting during his early years.

As we again neared London, I tried to persuade Polak to write his autobiography. He said that, at the age of 75, he no more had energy to go through his extensive files, papers and cuttings. Besides, much of his life's activity was confidential and he would not betray any confidence in any autobiographical writing. But I told Polak that, because of his early connection with Gandhi, he owed it to posterity to put down every memory of Gandhi as he knew him.

We parted at the Charing Cross Station, Polak going to his office near the Inns of Court and I taking a bus to the airport terminal for a plane to Ghana. We never saw each other again, although a few letters were exchanged. When I read of Polak's death in February, I realized that still another early—and precious—link of Gandhi with the living had been destroyed. I hope, however, that Polak's link with India and South Africa will remain. Surely there will some day arise permanent living memorials somewhere in independent India and non-racial South Africa for such unusual Englishmen as Henry S. L. Polak—or C.F. Andrews or Reginald Reynolds—long after some of the English colonial masters and the South African masters will have—and rightly—been forgotten.

Thoughts on Lincoln and Gandhi

R. NATESAN

12 February 1959 witnessed the nation-wide celebrations of the hundred and fiftieth birth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States of America. It is altogether fitting and proper that the government and people of the United States should make much of the occasion, for Lincoln was not only a great American leader but one of the outstanding figures of the nineteenth century. The impact of his ideas and ideals has been felt far beyond the borders of the American continent, even as those of Mahātmā Gāndhī have had a profound influence on contemporary life and thought. Lincoln's plea for government of the people, by the people, for the people has become the watchword of democratic thought all over the world, even as Gāndhī's experiments in *satyagraha* have opened a new era of hope and cheer to a war-weary world. There were obvious similarities in the lives of these two eminent men, so typical of their respective countries, alike in the depth and range of their interests and their passion for righteousness. Indeed it has been truly said that 'in the case of both, their private lives continuously faded and disappeared in their public activities'. Lincoln's impassioned plea for the Union of States and his steadfast advocacy of freedom for the Slaves are in perfect accord with Gāndhī's insistence on national unity and the uplift of the Harijans. And their tragic end at the hands of an assassin—was it the fulfilment of an heroic destiny? Indeed from the moment of his assassination in 1865 Lincoln ceased to belong to one nation or period and has passed into the ages as the symbol of all that is great and good in man. That explains the extraordinary hold he has on the hearts and minds of us in India where his sesquicentennial celebrations were observed with equal warmth and devotion in so many of our cities.

Like all great men Lincoln was misunderstood in his time, and for all the hundreds of volumes published about his life and achievements since his passing, controversies over his actions have continued without end, and he remains a myth to this day. He has become a legendary figure. Dr Richard M. Current, a noted American scholar and historian, has attempted to unravel many contradictory propositions that have been stated about Lincoln: namely, that he was unhappy with his wife and doted on the memory of another woman, Ann Rutledge, his first and only true love, and that he was devoted to his wife and children of whom he was really proud; that he was a born politician and that he was more often wooed by his opponents; that his strength came from profound religious convictions and that he was an agnostic (indeed he had to defend himself at election time lest his agnosticism should turn the voters away from him); that as wartime president he bungled military matters by interfering with his generals, and that he was a military genius, the master strategist of the war; that he was too tender-hearted and had not the nerve to pursue the harsh policies the war demanded, and that he was halting even in his campaign to free the slaves, that he showed courage and far-sightedness in his emancipation Proclamation, and that he was too soft to the rebels and was going way to demands that the South be punished for attempting to break the Union; and so on.

What is the truth and what is the falsehood in these clashing statements about Lincoln, asks Dr Current; and he furnishes his own answer:

No one could claim to say the final word on any issue of Lincoln's career, nor do I claim to have done so, but this much might be said—some of the apparent contradictions disappear when one takes properly into account two important facts about Lincoln.

One of these facts is that he grew in greatness. The Lincoln of 1863, the last year of his life, was not necessarily the same in all respects as the Lincoln of 1843, nor even of 1855 or 1860. He progressed in religious faith, in political and military ability, in the breadth of his humanitarianism, and in other ways.

The second fact, helping to explain the public career of Lincoln, is that he was a politician. That is not said in a derogatory sense at all. To rise to a position of top leadership in democratic society, to maintain that position and amass

support for constructive movement, a man must be skilled in politics. He must know the 'game'. Only by being a good politician can he become a great statesman.

Was Gandhi free from such misunderstanding? It was said that he fomented the revolt of labour against capital, and that he was hard on glove with industrial magnates, and in Delhi and Bombay was guest in British House; that he was deferential to the ruling princes and had a soft corner for the Mahajirits, and that he once asked them to strip themselves of their ornaments and jewellery and they walked out of his presence in disgust; that his simplicity and saintliness were only a cloak to hide his yearning for leadership. Annah accused him of disrupting the Moslems, Ambedkar of disrupting the Harijans, and the Hindu Mahā Sabha thought he was feeding snakes with milk. Gandhi was convinced that separatist electorates would perpetuate cleavages and put the minority in perpetual aloofness; but the minority leaders thought it was a cunning device to deprive them of their rights. The extremists thought he would succumb to the blandishments of imperialist diplomacy, while the moderates had grave misgivings that he was spoiling the chances of an honourable settlement with those in authority by his intransigence and obstinacy. Altogether everybody felt that he was a thorn in their side and would only create chaos by his queer call for civil disobedience quickly followed by an order for withdrawal in the wake of the slightest show of violence. What a life! To the end he continued alone in the midst of a shouting crowd who were not sure of their ground but followed him in their own interests so long as he played safe. Such was he who led the nation through the storms and stresses of successive crises.

No wonder that Lincoln, in the face of a grave peril to the Union, found himself in an inevitable position. But as President of the United States during the most crucial time of the nation's struggle he knew he was shaping history. 'Deeply conscious of his responsibility as the chief executive of the people's Republic he sought to influence his fellow countrymen to make and abide by right decisions.' In a brochure prepared by the United States Information Service for the commemoration of the Lincoln anniversary we are told that Lincoln's printed speeches and writings now total 1,078,365 words. The selected excerpts from this rich mine of words and thoughts constitute 'one of the great heritages of the American people'. But Lincoln, like Gandhi, was something more than a man. 'Time may despise the factual significance of his deeds', writes Ray P. Baker, 'but we must always know and acknowledge the shining spirit that illumines his words'.

Here are to be found some of the words and phrases that are not mere echoes of the past but charged with vitality for all time. In his first known public statement in 1832, he spoke of his interests and attitudes with a modesty coupled with a due sense of caution which has a familiar ring to us in India.

... I have spoken as I thought. I may be wrong in regard to any or all of them; but holding it as a sound maxim that it is better to be only sometimes right, than at all times wrong, so soon as I discover my opinions to be erroneous, I shall be ready to denounce them.

All that he cared for was of 'being truly esteemed of my fellowmen, by rendering myself worthy of this esteem'.

An ardent Whig at thirty, his speech on political issues in 1839 was marked by his innate firmness of principle:

Many free countries have lost their liberty, and ours may lose hers; but if she shall, he is my proudest plume, not that I was the last to desert, but that I never deserted her. . . . Broken by it, I too maybe, bow to it, I never will. . . . I swear eternal fidelity to the just cause, as I deem it, of the land of my life, my liberty and my love.

On the question of slavery his ceaseless controversy with Senator Douglas is now part of American history. He expressed his basic philosophy on the subject in his first major speech at Peoria, Illinois, in October 1854.

If the negro is a man, is it not to that extent a total destruction of self-government to say that he, too, shall not govern himself? When the white man governs himself that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism. . . .

What I do say is, that no man is good enough to govern another man, without that other's consent.

At the close of the Republican State Convention in June 1853 Lincoln delivered a speech defining his position precisely. The issue facing the country was so grave that his words literally startled the nation.

A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this

government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free.

And here is yet another famous fragment widely quoted:

As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy.

'In giving freedom to the slave', he said on a later occasion, 'we assure freedom to the free, honourable alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, that last best hope of earth.'

And here is a piece of Lincolnian eloquence on the spirit of liberty culled from a speech at Edwardsville, Illinois, in the same year:

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defence is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your own doors.

At the Cooper Institute in New York 'the great emancipator' addressed these words to the assembled Republicans:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.

In his first inaugural address on 4 March 1861, President Lincoln mapped a course of patient persuasion to keep the southern states in the Union, and appealed to them to avoid civil war:

In your hands my distressed fellow-countrymen and not in mine, is the momentous hour of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while I have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect and defend' it.

But war became inevitable. The man of peace was stunned by the tragedy that ensued. And in that classic little place at Gettysburg on 19 November 1863 he poured out his heart's blood when he said:

We cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men living and dead, who struggled here,

have consecrated it, far above my poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

And he concluded with that classic definition of democracy as the government of the people, by the people, for the people which has gained such currency in common speech.

The war over, and the Union stabilised in victory, Lincoln turned his attention to the great task of banding up the nation's wounds—a task which was nearest his heart. And in his second inaugural address he used words so reminiscent of Gandhi:

With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.

Readers of Gandhi will have felt the similarity of accent on peace and the verbal felicity of the thoughts that come straight from the heart.

But ere he started on his new mission that heart lay bleeding and at rest, struck by a shot from an assassin even as Gandhi was struck down on the morrow of the independence for which he laboured.

When all is said Lincoln remains a politician and a statesman while Gandhi remained to the end a saint and a social reformer. He strove for equal rights for all men—'equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'. Gandhi's pursuit for all the ills of life and society was *ahimsa* or the way of non-violence and truth. Are either of these attainable by the means adopted by Lincoln and Gandhi?

Christian Comment on Gandhi

THOMAS ROBERTS

My first public address on war was a broadcast in September 1939 at the request of All-India Radio—then virtually a department of the British Government of India—on the aims of Britain in World War II in the light of Mahātmā Gandhi's teaching on non-violence. Presumably it did not displease the government, for the Viceroy Lord Linlithgow had it sent to various neutral or isolationist centres including the U.S.A. I was no less anxious to satisfy Gandhi, because he seemed to me the best application of Christ's example and teaching to the problem of modern war.

I took the line that the war then beginning in defence of Poland represented the minimum of force without which the Nazi-Fascist philosophy of violence would infect the souls of free men everywhere. Our choice was for some violence in self-defence as the only possible price for teaching non-violence to our children.

But I had my misgivings. My memories were still vivid of the world war begun 25 years before as 'the war to end war'. Those intervening years had not ended war, but amounted to 25 years of cold war. Hitler replacing the Kaiser. Worse even than the concentration camp and the gas chamber was the danger that the crusaders of freedom would be infected by the very disease they were attacking—the deification of war not in theory but in practice—so that we came to adopt, one after another, the very crimes we had condemned in the enemy.

Here I ask leave to quote Fr L. C. McHugh of the Editorial Board of the *Jesus Weekly, America* (18 November 1958): He is but summing up the teaching of religious thinkers of the past twenty years, many non-Catholics, not a few Catholics on the Continent, of all too few in England and America, to see with him that the 'strategic thinking of modern large-

scale war has severed its ties with all the national aims of just war in the traditional sense. Worst of all, the majority of our people have somehow been conditioned to look with complacency on strategic concepts and war objectives which are completely unrelated to the demands of essential morality. What is the moral status of total war? What judgement shall we pass on mutual suicide among states?

In the radio talk over WMAL last month, William J. Nagle, Consultant to the Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, took note of the appalling lack of concern among religious-minded people over the moral aspects of all-out war. He charged that Protestants, Catholics and Jews have let this rupture with tradition go uncorrected and unopposed. To a large extent, Mr Nagle felt, the responsibility of public apathy towards the moral crisis of war lies at the door of American educators, writers and religious leaders—the very people who should be most effective in forming the conscience of contemporary

‘Why are professional moralists and theologians so silent?’

One reason is that like most other human beings they pass through the thought barrier much as air passengers today pass through the sound barrier without having shared the tribulation of the pioneers who first achieved the ‘impossible’.

To take one example, one of the very rare books on the subject published by Catholics is *Père Regamey's Non-Violence et Conscience Chrétienne* (Éditions du Cerf, Paris). Within a few years, no-one will find in his examination of Gandhian non-violence in relation to Christian principles anything remotely shocking. Yet this is his fourth version after three had been rejected by censors—priests liable to censure, to leave their ministry of healing to kill (of course in self-defence) in defence of the Church's law for her clergy. Latin priests are as liable to be conditioned by circumstances in their attitude to censure and conscientious objection as the German bishops and priests who, in two world wars, taught the duty of dying for Germany in self-defence, or as Indians justifying killing, first with, then against, Germans.

Such facts, incidentally, help to explain why Sir Stephen King-Hall finds that appeals for disarmament on purely religious grounds are not taken as seriously as are his pleas on purely strategic grounds. A lifetime of meditation (including a whole day weekly) and prayer about non-violence based largely on the Gospels convinced Gandhi that hardly any organized Christian body except the Quakers really faced up to the implications of Christ's teaching and example on non-violent war against evil.

An English adaptation of Pere Ragamey's important book should be less scholastic in approach, more concrete in such illustrations as America has in her Civil War of a century ago. Those who want a morally clean bomb on the ground that it is not intrinsically evil might be reminded of half the population of the States fighting to the death for retention of slavery. To call slavery intrinsically evil is forbidden to the Christian: Christ refrained from condemning it, the Apostles worked to sanctify it—but only because and as long as slavery remained so deep in the very structure of society that it could not be bombarded from outside. It had to be first understood within them, then hated, then thrown out.

Probably, Catholics quoted Popes for and against slavery (e.g. in Papal States) just as Catholics now are quoting Popes for and against retaining nuclear bombs.

Incidentally, if vested interests in the very heart of the Southern states pledged them to fight for slavery, what of our vested interests in 'defense'—billions poured out all over the West? About a hundred dollars, it is said, for every dollar spent in war against Eastern poverty, builds a rampart against Communism.

If all believers in the fundamentals of morality work together, they may find in moral argument against war guidance as welcome as the plan for flying proposed to the aviator by his plane's designer.

Gandhi in France

CAMILLE DREVET

Mahatma Gandhi was made known to the French-speaking people of the western world by Romain Rolland in 1934. 'This is the man', wrote Rolland, 'who raised 300 million people, shook the British Empire and started the most powerful movement in human policy in nearly 2000 years'. In one breath he invoked the two great figures of India—Tagore and Gandhi: 'O Tagore, Gandhi, rivers of India, like the Indus and the Ganges, holding in your double embrace East and West! Tributaries of God, scatter your seed over the world, sated by the ploughshare of violence'. Romain Rolland always followed Gandhi's action closely and in January 1932 was happy to receive a visit from his distant friend. But in 1939, on the occasion of the Mahatma's seventieth birthday, he regretfully admitted that he could not find in non-violence a possible solution of the problems of Europe. Whilst of the belief that 'the most urgent need was to defend by all means the freedom, independence and even the lives of the threatened peoples', he rendered homage to 'our master and brother', Gandhi, 'who in his heart and in his actions embodied our ideal of the humanity of the future'. And till his death Rolland retained a friendly attachment for the Mahatma.

+

Louis del Vasto, after a stay at Wanda, devoted the beautiful pages of his *Pelrinage aux Sources* to the Mahatma. He has since founded the community of the Ark, in the spirit of Gandhi, and in order to make the Mahatma's ideas better known, edits the collection,

1. Romain Rolland, *Mahatma Gandhi* (Stock) p. 124.

La pensée gandhienne.³ Alongside the *Letters to the Airmen*, translated and annotated by Jean Herbert, the first translation of the *Autobiography* was prefaced by Romain Rolland in 1930 and republished by Pierre Meile⁴ in 1951.

After Gandhi's visit, an important step was taken in France when Louise Guérys founded the International Study Group and its bulletin, *Nouvelles de l'Inde*, to which Madeleine and Romain Rolland, Jawaharlal Nehru, Edmond Fervet and a few other Indians contributed. It was this group which gave birth to the Friends of Gandhi Association, which Louise Guérys presided over and annexed until her death on 30 January 1949, exactly a year after the death of Gandhi.

Other groups, such as Reconciliation, France-Inde, Jacques Domergue's Universal Family, the Theosophical Society, Vivre en Harmonie and the International Civil Service, have devoted numerous studies to the Mahatma. Mention must be made of Elan Serdon's delightful work, *Le maître vie de Mahatma Gandhi*, which presents an authentic biography in the form of a poetic legend.

Félicien Challaye, in his *Les philosophes de l'Inde*⁵ concludes a study on Gandhi with the reflection that 'when the method of political action elaborated by Gandhi is applied to India, it will make possible an experiment of use to humanity as a whole'. And Albert Camus wrote in Gandhi 'the greatest man in our history'.

The Mahatma reminds Christians of the teachings of Christ, and Christians generally seem to be very moved by Gandhi's godliness. Protestants like Stanley Jones, Herr Rorer and Dr Corman were amongst the first to try to know the Mahatma better. But it was apparently Abbé J. Monchanon who, on Gandhi's death, assessed the rightful place Christians could give him in the spiritual evolution of the world. His deep knowledge of Indian religion and philosophy and the ten years he spent in Gandhi's country enabled him to follow the development of the action of the Mahatma, whom he regarded as a great genius of India and of the human community, and appreciate his import.⁶

3. Collection, *La Pensée gandhienne* (Denoel).

4. *Expériences de vie ou Autobiographie* by M. K. Gandhi, translated by G. Belmont introduction and notes by P. Meile. (Presses Universitaires) 1951.

5. Félicien Challaye, *Les philosophes de l'Inde* (Presses Universitaires) 1956.

6. The text of the lecture given by Abbé Monchanon at the Alliance Française, Funchery, in 1948, is annexed to G. Dreyer, *Four semaines de prières de Gandhi (Gandhi)*. Eight years later (in March 1956), during a stay in India, the author was able to ascertain that the Abbé's opinion had not altered.

Referring to Pascal's three orders, he recognized that if Gandhi was humble in the order of the flesh, and without peer in the order of the spirit, he had given 'a unique accent of sincerity to the truths belonging to the order of charity'.

'Gandhi personified India lost and regained . . . The anonymous India of the small people, of those who have no say . . . India at a tragic hour in its historic destiny and, finally, the eternal India, which I call the historic essence of India.

'To set him on a lotus, to deify him would be in contradiction with his dearest wishes. He knew his limitations, he knew that he was human like us all, be, our universal brother. . .

'Humanity is an organic whole, in the process of becoming; it is not possible to detach any essential part, such as Greece, India or China. Gandhi grasped the oneness of India and, through India, of all humanity. He made no great scientific discoveries, but he is one of those who, like Socrates, Plato and St Augustine, rediscovered the essentials, gave men back his soul and cleared the wells the Philistines had blocked up with sand. . .

'Gandhi is a religious man. His God, like Pascal's, is a God known through the heart, the God of direct religious experience.'

Abbe Monchanin was well aware of Gandhi's attitude to Christ and to Christianity. From the time when he discovered the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount, the Mahatma 'had never ceased to admire in Him one of the beings who had come nearest to God. For Gandhi the sacrifice of the Cross remained an eternal event in the history of humanity.' As for the Christianity of the occupants, he found it far from the teachings of Christ, for the Christian West had never stopped making war and oppressing other peoples. However, he had infinite respect for sincere Christians and counted some Protestants amongst his close friends.

None of Gandhi's writings suggests that he had any close contact with Catholics of the West. His mysticism, his fasting, silence and vows, and the importance he set on the chastity of those consecrated to the service of truth, would no doubt have brought him close to certain Catholics.

The Abbe thought that Gandhi could have adopted St Ignace's motto, 'Gloria Dei vivens herem', if he had known it.

At one of his prayer meetings, the Mahatma had this to say: 'The Moslems cannot harm Hinduism; only a Hindu can harm Hinduism. Just as only a Moslem can harm Islam, and a Christian, Christianity. Every man is responsible for his religion.' As long as he lives it in all its purity, a man can save his religion even in schism.

Christians do not have to hide the face of their Christ. 'Hindu friends, Moslem friends, do you think we love you any the less because we want to be transparent to you? We reject incoherence. Unity, as we wish it, will not be obtained by force or by ruse, by cowardice or abdication. It will be obtained by the emulation of holiness, by *satyagraha*, by *ahimsa*, as Gandhi taught them.'

+

It is in this spirit, made so abundantly clear by Abbé Monchanin, that other French Christians have judged Gandhi.

In the preface of a book devoted to the Mahatma, Father Lecom sees in him 'one of those sincere, upright souls, heading all the promptings of conscience and really forming a part of the mystic body of Jesus Christ. Invariably but surely, they stem from the great spiritual source of the Calvary, and therefore of the Church.'

'Gandhi's thought', wrote Mr Louis Massignon, 'appears to me as imbued with justice, but very much alive—an active desire to purify himself and others through action; his thought penetrates naked, essentially naked, the mud of a world of sin and dirt, so straight that nothing could deflect it from its course, because it was a vow introducing the moral and keeping the word given without breaking the bonds of community temperance'.¹

For Dr L. Coerman, Gandhi 'has reduced war to two factors and, rejecting brute force, has retained only spiritual force, self-sacrifice freely granted in the cause of one's ideal of justice and truth'. In every warrior, he says, there are two men—a hero and an executioner, that is, a man ready to meet death and a man ready to kill. Gandhi, by his faith, his intrepidity and his discipline, has created almost out of nothing a new type of warrior—the non-violent combatant, one

1. Preface to C. Devos, *Mahatma Gandhi, son indien* (Le-Roux, Strasbourg).

2. Louis Massignon, 'L'enseignement supérieur de la vie de Gandhi', in the same, *ibid.*

who resists the injuncts of the adversary with all his spiritual strength, but without ever harming the person of his adversary. . . .

"With spiritual might as sole arm, he has formed in India whole battalions of non-violent combatants. He has led them into battle with a technical mastery, an intrepidity, which makes him the equal of the greatest military leaders. And his many campaigns constitute a magnificent school of chivalry."⁸

In March 1955, Father Regamey, when dealing with non-violence and the love of one's enemies in his St Jacques course, naturally spoke of Gandhi. Later on, going further into the various aspects of violence, and seeking the way in which Christians should cultivate the gentleness of Christ, he was led to the following conclusion with respect to Gandhi: 'Non-violence as preached and practised by Gandhi sets the Christian conscience a problem which is not to be eluded', he wrote in his recent work *Non-violence et conscience chrétienne*. 'In the cruel world of today, this world of violence and hatred, a way has been cleared by love. This way has been used. We have seen an immense people liberated without violence. And we Christians believe we recognize in the victorious appeals of Gandhi the purest accents of the Gospel, precisely those which seemed too pure to be translated into action.'

And since 'it is Gandhi who shakes us from our lethargy', it is normal that we should recall the doctrine and action of the master of non-violence and, as Christians, attempt to assess their value.⁹

'Gandhi's experiment appears as "the last hope of the despairing, that of men who, in the huge crowd of those persecuted by injustice, ask themselves how they can live and not become unjust in their own way; the hope of those who want to remain poor in spirit, gentle despite the causes for violence and bitterness, without resentment in their afflictions, without hatred in their thirst for justice, merciful, pure and possible".'

In the light of this experiment, which must stir our conscience, Father Regamey throughout his book tries to make us 'see the Gospel with new eyes'.

8. Louis Corraze, *Les compagnons non-violents de Gandhi, école d' action* (Boulogne), by the same author, *La non-violence dans la conduite des peuples et de l'homme* (Boulogne), 1949.

9. Father Regamey *op. cit.*, *Non-violence et conscience chrétienne* (Éditions du Cerf, Paris) 1955, pp. 7-8.

+

Believers and humanists from all countries can meet around the Mahatma as they did in India for a quarter of a century—businessmen, socialist intellectuals, politicians, pious Moslems, pious Hindus, ignorant women and educated women alike. What did they all see in him? His unforbidding firmness, his gentle perseverance, his kind and exacting love, his undiminished energy, his unshaken faith?

Did they regard him as a revolutionary, or simply as a reformer? This question drew from him the reply: 'I have made revolutions while others talked about them.' This revolution is going on. This distant call of the Mahatma has brought a response in our midst.

According to the younger generation Gandhi is superseded. However, while millions of people are starving and oppressed, should we not identify ourselves with them?

'Can he save the world?' asks the missionary, Stanley Jones. 'Is he not the appeal God makes at the eleventh hour to the nations who are gliding towards catastrophe?'¹⁰

Henri Rousset writes, 'As the shadows deepen in a world in which natural violence is exacerbated by so much resignation and despair, the radiance of those who are creating (a world of love and peace) will increasingly become the sign of an indispensable hope'.¹¹ Is not Gandhi this radiance? What was the secret of his irresistible attraction? Pyärälä, who lived so close to him, answered, 'The perfect consonance of thought, word and deed'. His friend, Charlie Andrews, said, 'His alchemy of love'.

Is he really the prophet of the new age? No-one more than Gandhi has prepared for the future by educating himself and others. He kept a watchful eye on the present, but his gaze, free of personal or collective resentments, hereditary hatreds or mistrust, was pure enough to penetrate the future. And then, too, as Father Lorisson put it, he had 'a passion for the harmony created out of disorder, the unity achieved from multiplicity, a passion for the tranquility of order, a passion for peace'.

The peace we must make with ourselves. 'Be good', he said, 'and the world will be good. As is the drop, so will be the ocean.' Who can doubt the necessity of this conversion to love, which Dr Corman insists on: 'The fate of humanity is decided in each one of us. We must choose between the violence which will destroy us and the non-violence which, with the help of God, will save the world.'

10. Stanley Jones, *Mahatma Gandhi*.

11. *International Civil Service Bulletin*, December 1956.

Boundless Love and Natural Law

MARIE R. BYLES

I was getting my passport visâ for Ceylon. "Only for six months?" I queried.

"Yes, we treat you the same as you treat us."

"That is not a very Buddhist remark."

"Not very Christian either, but people have not got as far as that yet."

The idea in the vice-consul's mind is practically universal—that returning good for evil, loving your enemies and that sort of thing, is a command of God or Christ or Buddha. It is often said that Christ replaced the old retaliatory law with the law of love. He did nothing of the sort. Laws of nature are there all the time whether man notices their existence or not. The law of love was just as much a law before his day as after, and the retaliatory law did not cease to exist after him.

There are in the universe two opposing forces—the separating and the unifying. The separating force springs from the existence of individual entities; it causes the individual to tend to strike back when injured, and this applies to inanimate things as well as to human beings—if the soul is ill-treated it at once retaliates. The unifying force tends to draw things back into the one great whole. In the human sphere it may be spoken of as the law of Boundless Love.

These laws constantly interact and in themselves they are neither good nor evil. They are to be taken into account in ordering

human conduct, that is all, and certain facts about them should be better known and also taken into account.

The unifying force is by far the stronger. If it were not, all life would long since have ceased and the universe would have been dispersed. In the long run it must be irresistible. But in the short run it depends upon how great are the odds against it. During the Noakhali campaign, Gandhi sometimes wondered whether he was not at fault because the force of loving kindness seemed to fail. But it failed only in the same way as gravity fails when an aeroplane rises despite it. Good King Wenceslaus of Bohemia who lived in the tenth century earnestly tried to apply the same law, and it failed very badly, leaving behind only the well-known Christmas Carol. But St Louis, the only other European monarch who tried to apply it, did so most successfully, but by this time Christianity had spread and the odds were not so great.

The second thing to be observed is what the Buddha called 'the old-time law' that not by hatreds are hatreds calmed, but only by the opposite. Well-meaning people often overlook this and honestly think that cruelty can be overcome by cruelty. In a journal illustrating kindness to animals there was a story of a bully who ill-treated animals and was set upon by his indignant play-fellows and given a sound thrashing. After that he reformed and the story ended by his delivering a charming speech on how, having suffered himself, he would no more inflict suffering on others. Such a story could not be true in actual fact. Fire cannot be put out by fire. Negatives can be cancelled only by positives.

The last fact concerning the law of boundless love is that it is not a command to be obeyed, but a training to be undertaken. 'Thus must you train yourselves', is the Buddha's often repeated remark. The training required is the reduction bit by bit of the ego, so that there is nothing left that wants to retaliate. Egoism is the assertion of individuality with which we are born, and it can be chipped away only gradually, and with the help of prayer or meditation. In undergoing this training it is of help to have a clear grasp of the law by which we seek to govern our lives, but perhaps it is of even greater help to read examples of the working of the law in actual practice. For this reason let me tell of a small incident that recently came to my notice.

It concerns the Rev. Margaret Barr, a Unitarian minister who has established a Gandhian Basic Education school and rural centre in the Kani Hills of Assam, and who is known to many readers.

About half a mile away from her Centre lives an old lady. She was very poor and very full of complaints. Almost as soon as the Centre was started, she developed the aggravating habit of coming over and interrupting classes to complain about this, that or the other. At first Margaret was irritated and not a little short with her, especially when she came over with a dead hen and accused the Centre's sweet and docile dog of having killed it. It was strange that the dog should have chosen the fowl of a neighbour who lived half a mile away when the fowls of neighbours living closer were left unmolested. However, there was no proof that this amiable dog was not the culprit. So very reluctantly the cost of the dead fowl was paid, for never must it be possible to say that the head of a Gandhi Centre failed to do justice to an aged poverty-stricken woman.

Then one day it came to Margaret that this was no way to show the children how to follow Gandhi's example of overcoming evil with good. So next time the old lady came with her complaints, she was patient and gentle. And the next time she came with a dead fowl a brilliant idea came also. One of the girls was sent to procure one of the Centre's live hens and this was offered to the old lady in return for the dead one. The children ate the dead one—Kash ate not vegetables—and the old lady had the live one. However, the deal was only too satisfactory to the miserable old soul, and it did not prevent her from coming with more complaints and more dead fowls. Each time she was greeted with patient gentleness and each time a live fowl was substituted for the dead one, and the children had chicken for dinner.

Then the old lady began to change. It was not a quick change, but the intervals between the deaths of her fowls got longer and longer, and her complaints fewer and fewer. Finally, she ceased scolding and grumbling, and the fowls stopped dying. Then one day when she arrived threatening Margaret gave her an old darning wool. The next day she returned with a packet of potatoes from her garden. And now she is a model neighbour.

But as we study this law of boundless love, let us remember that it is not our actions, not even our words, that matter, but the thoughts that are in our minds. If Margaret had continued to cherish thoughts of ill-will all the live hens and darning wools would have had no effect at all. Contrary-wise it is conceivable (but almost impossible in practice) that the boys might have thrashed the bully with thoughts only of loving-kindness and brought about the desired result. It is from our thoughts that all that we say and do arises. If what is

in our minds is selfless and full of loving-kindness, the right words and the right action will follow automatically, and almost always these will be gentle. But the contrary does not follow. Words and actions may be gentle but unless they spring from a heart full of selfless love, they are useless in overcoming the retaliatory law.

And now to return to the passport. When I visited India in the end of 1933, I entered without any visa at all, never had to report to the police, stayed as long as I liked and departed with no greater formality than an income-tax clearance. Indians did not treat British subjects with Australian citizenship, as Australians treat them. Why? I suggest that one reason is that Gandhi consciously set the example of the wisdom of applying the law of boundless love. Indians are not better people than the Ceylonese. The only difference is that the Father of their Nation lived more recently than the Buddha and his words and example have not yet been forgotten.

WITH THE KINGS IN INDIA

A 34-page Souvenir of the visit of Dr Martin Luther King, the well-known American Negro leader, to India during February-March 1959, containing sixteen photographs, has been published by the Gandhi National Memorial Fund, New Delhi. The Souvenir is to be had at Rs 0.50 a copy.

Letters to the Editor

The Editor, *Gandhi Mārg*.

Sir,

In January, shortly before leaving for Europe, I met the Study Circle of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi in New Delhi, when I took the opportunity to put before them my feelings regarding the proposed Memorial for the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi at Rajghat.

I was prepared to find that people had a variety of views on the subject, but I was taken aback to discover that only one person in the whole audience had actually seen the model of the memorial, although it had been on view for a long time at the India 1958 Exhibition.

Why this apathy? One would have expected that people closely connected with Gandhi would be taking a living interest in the matter. But no—the memorial was in the hands of the Government, the ministers had approved the

design, and that was the end of it. But why should it be the end of it? For me it certainly is not; not even if work actually begins on the scheme, for I feel it my bounden duty to protest, and continue to protest against the insult to Gandhi's memory which the proposed memorial threatens to be.

I have carefully studied its design. Here is what the Chief Engineer, C.P.W.D., showed me, explaining every detail:

The model depicts the Smarak proper as it is at present, an octahedron shape, but surrounded on all sides by a huge mound of earth, leaving a square, open court around the central slab, and through this artificial hillock, for reaching the Smarak, are four tunnels on the four sides.

'But why make the hillock at all?' I asked.

'It is to create the surprise element', I was told. And I was

shown how, even when you enter any of these tunnels, you are still not able to see the actual Samadhi, as walls are placed across the end of each tunnel leaving room for people to pass round (reminding one painfully of public latrines!).

Then what does one finally see when one gets round these last 'surprise element' obstructions? A polished black granite slab the size and shape of the present cement one.

Well, surprise it certainly is to find a black monument! Bage another used black nor had anything to do with its mournful atmosphere. Of all things it is white which should be used for him.

Turning away from this unpleasant sight we find that the court in which we are standing has artificial 'caves' all round its sides, and on the walls of the caves, we are told, are to be low-relief or fresco representations of Bâpî's life story.

'These caves will be very popular with prostitutes and the like who are already using the Samadhi area as a rendezvous', I remarked.

But I have brought you right inside the Samadhi without explaining to you the approach.

On arriving at the outer entrance one sees strange-looking concrete constructions by the main gate.

'These are rustic huts, to give a rural touch', I was told, and it was pointed out how, at the same time, they prevent one from seeing directly into the Samadhi grounds (that surprise element again!).

Having negotiated these concrete *dhampdis* one soon finds oneself confronted with a huge black granite cube placed across the path and mounted on four little heaps of earth leaving just enough room for one to walk underneath. When one gets under this cube one finds that it is open at the top and has niches on the walls for lights.

'What is the exact meaning of all this?' I enquired.

The Chief Engineer did his best to explain. It seems that the open top is to represent Bâpî's love of the open sky, and that the lights in the niches on the walls are to symbolize his spiritual light.

Rather strange that one has to have a black cube in order to appreciate the limitless heavens, and artificial lights, rather than the sun's glory, to symbolize Bâpî's spirit!

Now I ask—is this the way to pay tribute to Bâpî's memory? And it is going to cost some forty-five lakhs of rupees into the bargain.

Why Gandhians don't benth

themselves is a thing which has astounded and deeply distressed me. I know it is impossible to control all the different memorials to Bâpû which are cropping up in India, but this one is the memorial, on the sacred spot where Bâpû's mortal remains were cremated, and the place to which people from all over the world go to pay homage to his memory. How can the Gândhians sit by watching, and doing nothing about it!

Then if this scheme is cancelled what should be done?

My own suggestion, as I have put it already in the *Hindustan Times*, is that no more grand designs should be called for.

Then let the place remain as it is, only changing the ugly cement slab and unsightly well-cum-fence to white stone or marble. For the rest let it be flowers and flowers, and trees and trees. Above all let there be a sapling or cutting from the peepal tree at Sevagram by which Bâpû always sat for his morning and evening prayers.

We cannot add one line to

Bâpû's greatness by elaborate memorials. Let his greatness be felt by the very simplicity of the sacred spot.

Mina Behn.

33 Clarendon Road,
London, W. 11.

The Editor, *Gândhî Mâg*.

Sir,

I was distressed to read in your April 1939 issue, which I have seen only belatedly due to my having been away in Japan, that Sh Rijagopâllikâhî feels that if my late husband, Reginald Reynolds, were still alive he would disapprove of what I had written about Schweitzer. On the contrary, it was Reginald who pointed out to me Schweitzer's inconsistencies. We saw completely eye-to-eye in the matter, as in almost all others. It distresses me, therefore, that anyone should suggest that after his death I should write anything of which my beloved Best Friend would have disapproved.

Ethel Mannan.

Oak Cottage,
27 Barchley Road,
London, S.W. 12.

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLICATIONS, TATA INSTITUTE
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, BOMBAY-38**

	Rs. & P.
DIARAY: AN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SURVEY OF A VILLAGE ..	1/50
GOING TO U.S.—A GUIDE Kanchappa, G. S. and Kumarappa, J. M. ..	6/75
HANDICAPPED CHILD. Wade, A. A. (Editor)	4/50
OUR BEGGAR PROBLEM—HOW TO TACKLE IT. Kumarappa, J. M. (Editor)	1/50
PUBLIC SHOPPING HABITS AND CONVENIENCES. Lopsana, A. M. ..	1/50
SEX DELINQUENT WOMEN AND THEIR REHABILITATION. Banerjee, G. R.	4/25
SOCIAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT IN A HOSPITAL. Banerjee, G. R. ..	1/00
STUDENTS AND SOCIAL WORK—By Students and for Students ..	1/25
TOWARDS BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE SICK CHILD Banerjee G. R.	1/75

INDIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL WORK

(Quarterly) Prof. A. R. Wade, M. P. (Editor)

Yearly subscription for India Rs. 10/00, for U.S.A. \$4.00 & for other countries
Rs. 11/00. Back numbers of the Journal are available.

THOUGHT

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS AND THE ARTS

IS JUST THE MAGAZINE TO

HELP ONE UNDERSTAND

THE TEMPO, DYNAMICS AND DIRECTION OF

EVENTS IN INDIA AND ABROAD

AND TRENDS & DEVELOPMENTS IN

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

KNOWN FOR ITS OBJECTIVE APPROACH AND

INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY

THOUGHT

SERVES TO PROMOTE UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN

ASIA AND THE WEST

SUBSCRIPTION - <i>Abroad</i> :	ANNUAL ..	Rs. 11-00
	SINGLE COPY 17 Napsa Pasts Only	
Foreign : ANNUAL ..	Rs. 23-50	
	Single Copy ..	9-50

Foreign: Air Mail Edition :	Annual	Six Months
U.K., Europe & East Africa	£ 3.17	£ 2.00
Americas	\$ 15.00	\$ 9.50
Asia & Egypt	£ 3.17	£ 1.17

THOUGHT :

35 FAIZ BAZAR, DELHI-7.

The Journal that enlightens . . .

The Teacher, the Parent and the Administrator

EDUCATIONAL INDIA

Now in its 26th year of useful service

**Dr. B. Gopala Reddi, Minister of Revenue & Civil
Expenditure, says :**

*"Educational India" has served the cause of education during
this quarter of a century. It can take legitimate pride that it
has served the purpose for which it was started.*

Annual :
Inland Rs. 5-50 nP.

Office :
Muzligatam

Annual :
Foreign Rs. 7-50 nP

THE RADICAL HUMANIST

Weekly periodical devoted to

Freedom, Truth And Co-operation

Founder : M.N. ROY

**Editors : ELLEN ROY
S. N. RAY**

*Each issue contains critical commentaries on current affairs, analysis of
social trends, essays in economic and political theory, literary and cultural
criticisms from persons of scholarship, distinction and taste*

*Also contains every week
unpublished writings of M.N. ROY*

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION :

**Inland Rs. 12/- ; Pakistan Rs. 15/-
Overseas 30s. ; £5.00**

*For subscription, agency terms and other
particulars write to :*

**Manager, THE RADICAL HUMANIST,
15, Basukin Chatterjee Street, CALCUTTA 12.**

INDIAN JOURNAL OF ADULT EDUCATION

(Quarterly Journal of Adult Education)

CONTENTS FOR SEPTEMBER, 1959

Basant H. Lall	— The Training of Leaders of Young Workers
Nitinilal Sahasrabudhe	— How Illiteracy was wiped out in the Soviet Union
A. M. Ivanova	— Organisation of Education of illiterate and Semi-literate adults in Soviet Union
	— Forum - Social Education in the Third Plan
Harbans Singh	— Audio-visual Materials for Social Education
Dr. Mohan Shikha Mishra	— Getting Acquainted : The President's Letter
Yashesh Kumar Dhanraj Chaudhary	— Place of Handicrafts in the Adult Education Programme in Sri Lanka
Arthur Jacobson	— Recent Trends in South Indian Book Cover Design
Carle Willgren	— Recreation and Survival

Rs. 5.00 (\$ 1.00 or Rs. 40) a year

Mar-Jun-Sep-Dec

INDIAN ADULT EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

17-B Indraprastha Marg,
NEW DELHI.

No. 2

AUGUST 1958

Vol. IV

THE INDIAN ECONOMIC REVIEW

The Principal Journal of The Delhi School of Economics

Edited by

V. K. R. V. Rao and B. N. Ganguli

I. Articles

The Role of Planning in a Socialist Economy	—	<i>Gajdar Langa</i>	1
Social Accounting	—	<i>S. M. Bhargava</i>	36
Delayed Unemployment and the Saving Potential	—	<i>R. J. Bhalla</i>	52
The Interview as a Research Tool and its Use	—	<i>M. H. Gupta</i>	59
Land Markets in the North Western Provinces (Uttar Pradesh) in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century	—	<i>Satish Chandra Gupta</i>	71

II. Notes and Memoranda

Unemployment, Relative Prices and the Saving Potential	—	<i>Jagdish Bhagwati</i>	71
Factorial and Marginal Theories of Growth	—	<i>William O. Thwaite</i>	82

III. Reviews

Price Rs. 4 or 5 Shillings net for a single copy

Annual Subscription Rs. 18 or 15 Shillings net

Editorial Communications, Books and Periodicals for review and communications respecting Advertisements are to be sent to the

Editor, The Indian Economic Review

The Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, Delhi-2

United Asia's Eleventh Anniversary Special Number

International Collaboration in the Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries

FEBRUARY 1958

*Offers Stimulating Discussion on
the Following Topics*

I Approach: To International Collaboration

- Robert Baron : Technical Co-operation in the Under-developed Countries.
Bogdan Crookmja : Economic Development of Under-developed Countries.
Hiroshi Kitamura : International Collaboration for Economic Development

II. Agencies At Work

- P. Gonschilke : The Colombo Plan.
Gordon Bashell : Progress on the Health Front
V. K. R. Menon : The International Labour Organisation and South East Asia.

III Foreign Governments Co-operation

- Howard E. Houston : Problems and Goals of United States Assistance.
Geoffrey Tyson : Capital Needs and Resources
Hoyden : Indo-Nepalese Collaboration.
W. A. Ritter : Indo German Co-operation.
S. H. Dassi : Economic Role of Japan in Asia.
The USSR, Co-operation with Economically Under-developed Countries.
Indo-Norwegian Co-operation

IV. Wide Perspectives of International Co-operation

- Earl J. Pchar : Impact of Science on South East Asia.
P. Y. Chinchankar : Forms of International Co-operation.

V. General and Statistical Data

- "Partners in Progress": Typical Instances of International Co-operation.
Points of View of Governments Towards Foreign Aid.
Djanda Kartawidjaya : Indonesian View-point on Foreign Aid.

UNITED ASIA

12 Rampart Row, Bombay-1

GANDHIAN LITERATURE

BY MAHATMA GANDHI	Price	LATEST PUBLICATIONS	Price
<i>Autobiography</i>	2 00	<i>India of My Dreams</i>	2 50
.. (School Edition)	1 50	<i>Mohan Mala</i>	1 00
<i>Raja's Letters to Mira</i>	2 50	<i>Panchayat Raj</i>	0 50
<i>Birth Control</i>	0 40	<i>Mahatma Gandhi—Correspondence</i>	
<i>Basic Education</i>	1 00	With Govt. 1944-47	6 00
<i>Cent Festival Swadeshi</i>	1 50	<i>Communism & Communists</i>	0 20
<i>Drugs, Drugs and Gambling</i>	2 00	<i>The Moral Basis of Vegetarianism</i>	0 25
<i>Economic & Industrial Life & Relations—3 Vols.</i>	3 00	<i>Non-Violent Way To World Peace</i>	0 25
<i>Evil Wrought by English Medium</i>	0 25	<i>The Message of The Gita</i>	0 25
<i>Food Shortage and Agriculture</i>	2 50	<i>Women's Role In Society</i>	0 25
<i>Gandhi's correspondence with Government (1942-46)</i>	2 00	<i>Opal Krishna Gokhale</i>	0 00
<i>Hand Spun</i>	0 50	<i>The Payment of Life</i>	4 00
<i>Hindi and English in the South</i>	0 50	<i>Towards New Horizons</i>	2 00
<i>Homage to the Departed</i>	2 50	<i>The Miracle of Calcutta</i>	1 00
<i>Key to Health</i>	0 50	<i>Population Control</i>	0 50
<i>Letters to Sardar Vallabhbhai</i>	2 50		
<i>Mind of Mahatma Gandhi</i>	4 00	BY OTHERS	
<i>My Religion</i>	2 50	<i>Bal Gangadhar Tilak</i>	7 00
<i>Non-violence in Peace and War</i>		<i>A Philosophy of Indian Economic Development</i>	2 50
Vol. I & II	12 50	<i>A Shramadutta Prigangee</i>	0 40
<i>Ramayana</i>	0 65	<i>The Long Road</i>	2 00
<i>Rebuilding Our Village</i>	1 00	<i>Shoodra Yojna</i>	0 87
<i>Removal of Untouchability</i>	2 50	<i>A Vision of Future India</i>	0 75
<i>Satyagraha in South Africa</i>	4 00	<i>Gandhi & Marx</i>	1 00
<i>Sarvodaya (Welfare of all)</i>	2 00	<i>The Diary of Mahadev Das</i>	5 00
<i>Self-Restraint Vs. Self-Indulgence</i>	2 00	<i>Gita According to Gandhi</i>	
<i>Selections from Gandhi</i>	2 00	(Cardboard-bound)	4 00
<i>Ta Shastri</i>	2 00	(Paper-bound)	2 00
<i>Towards New Education</i>	1 50	<i>A Campaign for Civilization</i>	1 00
<i>Thoughts on National Language</i>	2 50	<i>Which Way Lies Hope ?</i>	2 00
<i>Truth is God</i>	1 00	<i>Sardar Vallabhbhai Vol. I & II</i>	14 00
<i>Towards Non-violent Socialism</i>	1 00	<i>The Story of The Bible</i>	2 00
<i>Women</i>	1 00	<i>This Was Days</i>	2 50
		<i>Pilgrimage for Peace</i>	2 00

Postage not extra

Detailed Catalogue sent free on request

BY PARUL

MAHATMA GANDHI—THE LAST PHASE

VOL. I & II

(Authentic biography covering last phase of Gandhi's life)

Price each Vol. Rs. 20/-, Postage Vol. I Rs. 3/- Vol. II Rs. 3/50

NAVAJIVAN TRUST

P.O. NAVAJIVAN, AHMEDABAD-14.

Branches :

Connaught Circus, New Delhi ; 110 Palacca Street, Bombay-2 ; Khada Gramodyog Bhavan, Dadabhai Nauroji Road, Bombay ; Amnashala Park, Lucknow ; Govind Mira Road, Patna-4 ; 41 Eden Hospital Road, Calcutta 72 ; 22/111 Miran Road, Ahmedabad ; Yashwantrao Road, Indore ; Chauda Baza, Jaipur.

A Look at Our Back Numbers

July 1957

- | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| John S. Heyland | Mahatma Gandhi and the War on War |
| W.E.B. Du Bois | Gandhi and the American Negroes |
| Lord Birdwood | Gandhi and Communism—a Speculation |

October 1957

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| R. B. Dimskar | Gandhian Non-violence : a Landmark |
| S.G. Bhavs | Satyagraha and Democracy |
| P.T. Raja | The Four Basic Principles of Gandhi's Philosophy |

January 1958

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| S. Radhakrishnan | A Divided Inheritance |
| U.N. Dikhar | Britain and the Socialist Pattern of Society |
| Gyan Chand | Britain as a Social Revolution |

April 1958

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| V.M. Bodekar | Ahimsa in the Mahabharata—and Gandhi |
| Homer A. Jack | Gandhi and the Communists |
| Richard B. Gregg | A Peasant's Five-Year Plan |

July 1958

- | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| B. Natesan | Gandhi and Thoreau |
| J. Vijayaratnam | Gandhi—a Man Alone |
| R.G. Gokhale | Gandhism and Socialism |

October 1958

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| Vinoba Bhave | The Socialist Wisdom |
| Reginald Reynolds | Jack Heyland—an English follower of Gandhi |
| Euse Wyss-Tyssen | The True Significance of Gandhi |

January 1959

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| George Hendrick | Gandhi and Dr Martin Luther King |
| Harris Wolford | Non-violence and the Law |
| P. C. Gupta | Impact of Gandhi on Hindi Literature |

April 1959

- | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Hem Nishanjee | Gandhi and the Communist Party |
| Gene Sharp | Britain Considers Her Weapons |
| N.R. Malkani | Whether Higher Education ? |

July 1959

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Telldis E. Chaudhuri | Gandhi and the Revolutionary Socialist Party |
|----------------------|--|

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| James E. Bristol | Reflections of a Pacifist after 18 Months in India |
| M. Yamanacharya | Gandhi in Kannada Literature |

Copies of some of these numbers will be available

G A N D H I M A R G

Delight New Delhi-1